THE RUSSIAN REVIEW



An American Quarterly
Devoted to Russia
Past and Present

July
1954

Vol. 13, No. 3 *Price $1.25*

Contributors to This Issue

GEORGE P. IVASK has lectured at Harvard and at the Middlebury Summer School and has contributed poetry and essays to Russian magazines in Paris and New York; he is the editor of George Fedotov's collection of essays, *Novyi grad*, New York, Chekhov Publishing House, 1952, and of an anthology of Russian emigré poetry (in Russian), New York, Chekhov Publishing House, 1953.

N. VALENTINOV is the pseudonym of Nicholas V. Volsky, an early member of the Bolshevik faction of the Social Democratic Party, who, after a year's association with Lenin in Geneva in 1904, broke with Lenin personally and with Bolshevism forever. His book of memoirs, *Vstrechi s Leninym*, was published by the Chekhov Publishing House in 1953.

VALENTINE TSCHEBOTARIOFF BILL was a research assistant at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton from 1939 to 1944; since 1946 she has been a lecturer in Russian at Princeton University.

VERA SANDOMIRSKY has written poetry and literary criticism and has contributed to *Books Abroad*, *Italica*, *Poetry*, and *Common Cause*; at present she is on the faculty of Wayne University.

JACOB WALKIN is a specialist in political science, whose doctoral dissertation, *State and Society in Tsarist and Communist Russia*, is to be published by the University of California Press; at present he is a research analyst with the U. S. government.

RODERICK PAGE THALER was an instructor in history at the University of Rhode Island and is now a graduate student in history at Harvard University.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present

Vol. 13 JULY 1954 No. 3

* * *

The "Empire" Period, *George Ivask* 167

Encounters with Lenin, *N. Valentinov* 176

Faith and Reason in Russian History, *Valentine Tschebotarioff Bill* 186

The Spirit of the New Soviet Middle Class, *Vera Sandomirsky* 193

Government Controls Over the Press in Russia, 1905-1914, *Jacob Walkin* 203

The French Tutor in Radishchev and Pushkin, *Roderick Page Thaler* 210

BOOK REVIEWS

The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923, Vol. 3, *by* Edward H. Carr, *Richard E. Pipes* 213

How Russia is Ruled, *by* Merle Fainsod, *Warren B. Walsh*..... 214

Soviet Opposition to Stalin, *by* George Fischer, *Raymond H. Fisher* 216

La formation de l'Empire Russe, *by* Boris Nolde, *Andrew Lossky* 218

Continued on Page II

Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles, *by* Nicholas V. Riazanovsky, *Valentine T. Bill* 221

The Proletarian Episode in Russian Literature, 1928-1932, *by* Edward Brown, *Jack F. Matlock, Jr* 222

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books, pamphlets, and articles on Russia published in 1953, *Virginia L. Close* 224

Letter to the Editor 243

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt
Editor

William Henry Chamberlin — Warren B. Walsh

Michael Karpovich — Alexis Wiren

The purpose of *The Russian Review* is to interpret the real aims and aspirations of the Russian people, as distinguished from and opposed to Soviet Communism, and to advance general knowledge of Russian culture, history and civilization. The Review invites contributions by authors of divergent views, but the opinions expressed in any individual article of this journal are not necessarily those of the editors.

Books for review and correspondence concerning reviews should be sent to Professor Warren B. Walsh, 113 Maxwell, Syracuse University, Syracuse 10, New York.

Copyright 1954 by the Russian Review, Inc., 235 Baker Library, Hanover, N. H. Published quarterly in January, April, July and October. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Hanover, N. H., under the Act of March 3, 1897 with an additional entry at the post office in Brattleboro, Vt. Subscription rates: $5.00 a year in the United States; Canada $5.50; foreign $6.00; single issues through Vol. 12, $1.00; subsequent single issues $1.25. Cumulative Index to Vols. I–X (Nov. 1941, Oct. 1951), $.75 per copy. The contents of this publication cannot be reprinted without permission of the editors. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

The "Empire" Period

By George Ivask

The division of history into periods is a necessary convention. However, it is important to beware of some specific terms which have frequently been used to periodize the history of culture. For example, the terms classicism and romanticism, particularly in their application to the Russian scene in the early part of the nineteenth century, are quite unsatisfactory. The Russian romantics were at the same time classicists, while the classicists were also romantics. In my opinion, "Empire" is the best and most appropriate term to describe the first thirty years of the past century in Russia. It covers the varied cultural aspects of that period, and it also enjoys wide currency—at least it has been assimilated by the Russian mind.

Usually this term is applied to architecture exclusively. It is the style of the Napoleonic Empire, which was adopted by the Russian Empire, and had for many Russians paradoxically patriotic and nationalistic overtones, recalling Napoleon's retreat from fire-ravaged Moscow. The group of buildings by Carlo Rossi—the Alexandrine Theater and the Military Staff Center with its arch-way, the monumental buildings of the Senate and the Synod—were especially characteristic of the Empire style of architecture in Peters-burg. Austere simplicity, smooth walls and wall porticos, Doric columns, appealed to Russia. This style is cold, powerful, and somewhat abstract. It is the abstraction of a new bureaucratic-military empire—often cruel and reactionary, but aspiring to a certain supra-national justice. The brilliant Italian, Rossi, em-bodied this Roman idea in architecture, to the delight of his imperial clients. This Roman concept in "barbarian Russia" was dear to them.

The emperors, however, did not incorporate it into politics. In foreign affairs Russia adopted rather the Austrian policy. Chancellor Nesselrode admired and emulated Metternich. Under Alexander I (1801-1825) and also Nicholas I (1825-1855), the trend in domestic affairs was not Roman but Prussian and militaristic. The great jurist and administrator Speransky, an admirer of the Napoleonic code and the protagonist of a moderate constitution, was the only advocate of Roman and French ideas. At the outset of the war against Napoleon in 1812, he was dismissed and even accused of high

treason to the state, but he managed to accomplish a great deal. He used new universities chiefly for the training of educated officials, who were recruited principally from among the children of priests. Speransky himself sprang from the clergy, which in Russia was a close-knit, hereditary class. He was the creator of that Russian bureaucracy which existed up to the very outbreak of the Revolution of 1917. The officials were corrupt. But before Speransky's time, bribery was immeasurably more prevalent and order of any sort was non-existent. He himself was honest and progressive, and he achieved some results. In the 1830's, when he had been reinstated, he codified the Russian laws, establishing a very precise language for Russian juristic science, which he desired to correlate with the Latin. This partisan of Roman and French ideas would have accomplished still more had he not been hampered by Prussian militarism, which had been distorted and carried to absurd lengths in Russia by Arakcheev, that evil genius of Alexander I.

The peasants, who represented the bulk of the population, remained serfs. It should be said that both brothers, Alexander I and Nicholas I, were opponents of serfdom, but the opposition of the nobility paralyzed their modest attempts at reform. Except for the very outset of Alexander's reign, the first three decades of the nineteenth century were, on the whole, a time of reaction.

Petersburg, renamed Leningrad, has remained from this epoch a city owing much to Rossi, the master of the Empire period, and to other illustrious architects. It is built on swampy ground. Its climate is foggy and unhealthful. The banks of the Neva are faced with granite, but terrible floods often inundate the entire city. Petersburg presents a striking contrast between the squalid north, with its gray skies and damp air conducive to tuberculosis, and classical edifices reminding one of the flourishing Graeco-Roman south. Dostoevsky, who felt that Petersburg was a phantom alien to Russia, was acutely aware of this. But the former capital of imperial Russia may be viewed from another angle; Pushkin, the great poet of the Empire period, said of Petersburg, which had been created by the iron will of Peter I (in 1703): "I love thee, masterpiece of Peter. I love thine aspect, graceful and severe, Neva's mighty stream, her granite banks, stiff lace of iron fences, the limpid dusk and moonless radiance of nights so full of thought."

The Bolsheviks have flanked Russia with an iron curtain. The Soviet school system is a product of the most primitive forms of propaganda. It is a school of lies. But Petersburg is preserved in

buildings by Rossi and in poems by Pushkin, which Russian children still memorize. The architecture and poetry of the Empire period are, as it were, substitutes for the free school: they are European monuments in Russia; in the living language of art they bespeak the early and modern history and the best traditions of Europe. Of course, the significance of art in education and psychology must not be exaggerated. But because of Petersburg, although renamed Leningrad, and because of Pushkin, whom Soviet propaganda distorts but whom it cannot destroy, more is known about Europe and the treasures of the West in Red Russia than in Red China.

It should also be recalled that a group of revolutionary officers, inspired by the French Revolution and the civic virtues of Brutus, that Roman assassin of tyranny, attempted to make imperial Petersburg a republican city. But their uprising of December 14, 1825, during the interregnum following the death of Alexander I, ended in failure. And even if they had managed to seize power, it is doubtful that their rule would have endured. The peasants lived by the myth of the tsar, who was a captive of the landed nobility. And the peasants would not have accepted an oligarchy of nobles, even if it had been very liberal and had striven to emancipate them. Petersburg remained imperial, but its style could nevertheless have become republican. Today the Empire period, as an historical epoch, is only history. But the brilliance of its culture has never been surpassed; it enters more or less into the mind of every cultured Russian, regardless of what school he attended, and this will always be so.

In addition to the "empire" of Rossi and other architects in the capital, there was the "empire" of Moscow and the country estates. This was the style of the nobles' mansions in central Russia. Here classical white pillars rose up among the yellow fields of rye and the verdure of linden, oak, maple, and birch. They were not always constructed of stone; frequently wood was used, as in the American colonial style. The provincial empire style of the country also prevailed in Moscow, which, with gross exaggeration of course, was then called a "big village." Here stands that monument of architecture, Theater Square, created by Bova, the Italian. And yet houses with spacious gardens and even parks, sometimes in the very center of town, were more characteristic of old Moscow.

Most of the landed nobility who lived in and around Moscow had little culture, although they knew French, the language of high society. The life and manners of this nobility have been ridiculed in Griboedov's brilliant classical comedy, *Woe from Wit*. But few peo-

ple in this noble class had a very high level of culture. They were European by education, and at the same time they regarded themselves as the national elite of Russia. Many revolutionaries (Decembrists) and liberal Masons emerged from the milieu of this provincial and more intimate "empire" in Moscow and the estates. In the 1820's and 1830's, student philosophical circles were formed in Moscow, first by the admirers of Schelling and later by the followers of Hegel. These were, strictly speaking, the only real romanticists of the Empire period.

The Moscow salon of the art-loving Princess Volkonskaya, which attracted musicians, artists, and poets, including the great Polish poet Mickiewicz, then under police surveillance, was outstanding. Contrary to the satirical descriptions of Griboedov, an atmosphere of freedom and culture then reigned in Moscow society. We learn from Zhikharev's memoirs how one Moscow lady of that time, Nebolsina, extended the same cordial welcome to poor students that she extended to General Rostopchin, Governor of Moscow. These virtues of warm hospitality and inward culture were later described by Tolstoy in *War and Peace* (the Rostov family).

The highest contribution of the Russian nobility in the Empire period was, of course, literature, primarily poetry and epistolary prose. This period, universally recognized as the golden age of Russian poetry, was the epoch of Pushkin. The entire Empire period in Russia can be approximately measured by the dates of his birth and death: 1799-1837. Pushkin spent his childhood in Moscow. He went to school in Tsarskoe Selo near Petersburg at the famous Lyceum, which ranked among Europe's best institutions of learning. Its students were not weighed down by science and knowledge, but an atmosphere of culture and freedom prevailed. The Lyceum was redolent with the spirit of humanism.

Pushkin's verses on Petersburg, which I have quoted above, are taken from his last poem "The Bronze Horseman." This poem, a gem from the treasure house of Pushkin's poetry, was inspired by Rossi's imperial Petersburg. But *Eugene Onegin* outshines all his poetry. It reflects all the styles of the Empire period—the country estates, Moscow, and Petersburg. His model was Byron's romantic "Don Juan" and "Beppo," but without Byron's declamation, his rhetoric, his romanticism. Russian critics used to interpret this "novel in verse" as a "transition from romanticism to realism." But realism is an even more indefinite concept than romanticism. The rigidity and difficulty of *Eugene Onegin's* poetic structure should

be noted first of all. This "novel in verse" is divided into stanzas of the sonnet type. There are two main characters in addition to Onegin and Tatiana—Pushkin himself and his Muse, who seems to be the twin sister of Tatiana. Onegin and Tatiana provide the subject matter of the novel, which is most reminiscent of the style of the eighteenth century English novel and Jane Austen. Pushkin and his Muse furnish the theme for the lyrics—separate stanzas are conceived as independent poems.

The wisdom of this "novel in verse" lies in its truthfulness. Pushkin does not resort to metaphysics. He possesses some traits of the Russian Voltairian atheist of the eighteenth century, but he lacks the cold pessimism and egoism of Voltaire. He has the intimacy of true poetry. The character of Tatiana always delights Russian readers. She is a pure flower of the rural empire style in Russia. She knows the meaning of love. The old English novels of Richardson or Rousseau's *La Nouvelle Héloise* did not make her sentimental. Her passion for Onegin is natural. At the end of the novel, she rises in all her moral stature, as she sees the vanity of fashionable society in Petersburg and gives up her chance of happiness with Onegin.

Pushkin the humanist was a stranger to the Church and seemingly even to Christianity in general, but his Tatiana is above all a Christian; humility, obedience, self-abnegation, and sacrifice are nearest to her heart. Pushkin's Muse, who resembles Tatiana in certain respects—a character who is human as well as a rhetorical figure in his novel—also arouses delight. Her world is filled with fantasies and day-dreams; sometimes she frolics like a maenad, but she can also be serious, pensive, and quiet like Tatiana. A great work of art always transcends any concept of "style" or "epoch." It becomes a legend, acquiring a charm which cannot be defined. The characteristics of "style" and "epoch" assume less importance, but they remain. The lucidity of language and expression, of all the words and sounds, in *Eugene Onegin* is characteristic of the Empire period and classicism on Russian soil.

After the Empire period we know that Russian literature became universal, with Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Leskov, and Chekhov, but all these great writers lost the Empire sense of moderation, order, and discipline. Perhaps they gave better voice to Russia, to her spirit and thought; perhaps they were her true prophets. Nevertheless Pushkin, according to the poet Tutchev, still remains "Russia's first love"; perhaps Russians love him just because they lack above

all the sense of moderation which Pushkin has—Pushkin the humanist, the European, the "Westernizer," the "classicist."

Other poets of the Empire period are also outstanding. First there is Batiushkov, who discovered his own unique "harmony" of poetic language and sound. Pushkin owed much to him. And the Soviet poet Mandelstamm, who died in Siberia in exile, said that Batiushkov introduced "the murmur of poetry, the call of brotherhood and the harmonious flow of tears . . ." into Russian poetry. Zhukovsky is noted for the melodic quality of his poems. He is primarily a romanticist, but the great prophetic themes of romanticism, as in the poetry of the Polish romanticists, were not suited to his mellifluent poetry. Delvig, Pushkin's closest friend, was the most adept with Russian hexameters, which Gnedich had used before him in translating the *Iliad*. There are several marvelous hexameters also in Pushkin. Their relation to the ancient world—for instance, to Homer—is matched to a certain degree in Keats. The latter's sonnet "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer" corresponds to two of Pushkin's hexameters on Gnedich's translation of the *Iliad*. In substance, Keats' lyric is congenial to Pushkin's poetry and to that of his friend Delvig.

Among the poets of the period, I shall mention Baratynsky and his philosophical lyric. He is the only real metaphysician of that epoch. His poem "The Last Death" is remarkable; he prophesies that pure intellectual culture may destroy mankind. Of the people of the future he says: "They trod the earth with labor and their marriages were barren." Thought is fatal to the emotions and the mind. . . . Recently the German critic Stammler ranked this poet-philosopher with such modern poets of thought as Valéry, T. S. Eliot, and Auden.

The epistolary prose of the period is similarly outstanding. In those days letters were written with copies, which the recipients distributed among their friends. These epistles took the place of free literature, which was impeded by censorship. It would be a good idea to publish a small anthology of letters from the Empire epoch in English. Among the masters of this genre were Pushkin and another poet, Vyazemsky, who was raised by the Jesuits. He was the son of a prince from the house of Rurik and an Irish mother.

We do not find the inward life reflected in the letters of that time. They lack warmth, but they abound in intellectual brilliance and wit, plays on words and puns, many indecent and blasphemous expressions, reminiscent of the letters of Abbot Galiani in the eight-

eenth century. Thus Vyazemsky wrote that fanciful melancholy and sadness are central in the life and work of the poet Zhukovsky. And he blasphemed wittily: "a happy Zhukovsky is impossible—like a representation of the Savior on the cross, with rosy cheeks, a triple chin, and a piece of pie in his mouth." Vyazemsky's impetuous metaphors are also amusing; he compares the cumbrous rules of grammar with the ancient régime, and himself, writing carelessly and boldly, with Napoleon. He was far removed from the revolutionary plans of the Decembrists. His demands were moderate—a constitution, freedom of speech, and the abolition of torture and capital punishment. In general he is very characteristic of the Empire period. Wigel, an author of memoirs, wrote of him as follows: ". . . with women he was animated and pleasant, like a Frenchman of the old days; with men he was aloof, like an Englishman; among his friends he was a Russian *bon vivant*."

Let us dwell briefly on the art of prose, which was fully developed only in the later years of the Empire period. The epistle and table talk were the preparatory stage for it. In the 1830's Pushkin took up prose. His best works of prose are the *Queen of Spades*, adapted by Chaikovsky for his opera, the *Captain's Daughter* (on the epoch of the Pugachev rebellion), and especially his *Travels in Arzrum*. His prose is precise and dry. According to Edmund Wilson it is reminiscent of Jane Austen. He does not portray the "inward man," as Lermontov, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Chekhov did later. The psychology of his heroes can be judged mainly by their words and actions. His expressions and epigrams are brilliant, as though they were alien to the Russian language, which comes closer to expressing the language of the heart than that of the intellect.

Drama, with the exception of Griboedov's comedy *Woe from Wit*, mentioned above, was rather a failure. Pushkin's historical tragedy *Boris Godunov* is not a success; it has been called the fruit of his ill-starred love for Shakespeare. Gogol's penetrating comedy *The Inspector General*, written at the very close of the Empire period (1836), does not fit altogether into this epoch.

For us today the cultured aristocratic elite of the Empire period is a thing of the remote past, like the Romanov monarchy in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. In many respects this period has been condemned by history, not only by the Bolsheviks, but long before them by the radical Russian intelligentsia, and even by their progenitors, Belinsky and Herzen, who had begun to write during Pushkin's time. For that state and that culture were built

upon serfdom, although serfdom was condemned by the best people of the time. It is particularly obvious that we are confronted here by the question of *quality* and *value*. The empire is no more and neither is the Russian nobility, but the classic palaces, theaters, groups of buildings, and mansions of Rossi, Thomon, Bova, Gilardi, A. Grigoriev, Stasov, and others are still standing. Yes, these precious monuments of Europe in Russia are unsurpassed. The unexcelled poetry of this golden age of Russian literature, as well as its polished models of Russian prose and letters, still survive. In this respect, the Empire period is one of the few consummate achievements of Russian genius.

The Empire period brought to the Russian mind a sense of order, discipline, measure, stability, and freedom based on tolerance, which had been lacking in Russia. Russia, though long since a great power, had always been unhappy, frenzied—suffering now from anarchy, now from tyranny. If another Russia were possible, the materials for its construction should be sought in the concepts, images, and ideas of the Empire period, and, moreover, not so much in Petersburg as in Moscow and the provinces. The experience of the noble elite of that time could be turned to advantage; it could extol the empire (Pushkin's "Bronze Horseman"), but its best creative forces and values—humanism, the concept of human dignity—took shape in the quiet atmosphere of the estates and in Moscow. This elite also sympathized with the oppressed peasantry, but it did not idealize it, as sometimes the later intelligentsia did, for whom the common Russian people were saints. The elite of the Empire period cherished sober truth and independence above all. "To depend on the tsar or the people—what is the difference to us," wrote Pushkin shortly before his death. He denounced the courtly aristocracy of imperial Petersburg, but he also denounced the Russian type of rebellion as senseless and cruel.

Present-day Russia has lost much. It knows nothing of God and Christianity. The catechism has long been abolished in the schools. Young people may not respond to atheistic propaganda, but even so they do not read the Gospel. They also know nothing of democracy in our Western sense. But literature, which is often distorted by propaganda, is not forgotten, although the Bolsheviks make Pushkin a Bolshevik before Bolshevism. And they have almost taken Dostoevsky out of circulation altogether. And yet many of the best literary works are still available in Russia. The great writers who came after Pushkin's time, Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Leskov,

and Chekhov, wrote principally of compassion and self-sacrifice. Their cast of mind was primarily ethical and sometimes ethical-religious, as in the case of Dostoevsky. These writers were actually the conscience of Russia. Their absolute ethical standards—so-called Russian maximalism—are of tremendous value in educating the emotions of the young generation, while the Empire period, the most intellectual and esthetic period of all, is the best school for the mind, for self-discipline and self-restraint, for the development of a sober and critical attitude toward life, for the precise and lucid expression of thoughts and desires. The great poet of the period, Pushkin, who in his works of art placed the greatest value on plan, disciplined his thinking to a greater degree than any of the Russian ideologists, both "leftist" and "rightist"; furthermore, he always tested his thinking with the touchstone of his heart. In his mind, he often despised people, but in his heart was benevolence. By culture he was a humanist and virtually an atheist, but by feelings and nature he was a Christian.

Many aspects of the period have not been mentioned here. I merely wished to call attention to this most creatively (though not politically) successful epoch in Russian culture. It is of interest not only to historians and literary scholars. A study of it is of vital and practical interest. Some day the treasures of the Empire period may play a great rôle in re-educating Russia in the spirit of humanity and freedom. The Bolsheviks failed to destroy the Empire period, its architecture and particularly its literature. In Pushkin's language, which is known to everyone in Russia from childhood, it is easy to tell the Soviet citizen of all that we are defending in the world from Bolshevism and all that we stand for in defiance of Bolshevism: the free man, free society, and free creative labor.

*Encounters with Lenin**

By N. Valentinov

. . . The next day I called on Lenin and gave him, of course, an account of my visit to Plekhanov. Lenin had a high regard for Plekhanov, who impressed him more than anyone else—more, even, than Kautsky or Bebel. Everything Plekhanov said, did, or wrote, excited his keenest interest. "He is a man of colossal stature; he makes one shrink," Lenin once remarked to Lepeshinsky. So now he made me relate in detail what had put the fat in the fire. I had to go far back to the prologue to the story and begin with a description of the Kievan group of religious dissenters and the part played in it by Semion Petrovich and his ideas.

I remember Lenin standing by my chair, his thumbs stuck into the armholes of his waistcoat, and listening with obvious curiosity. When I touched on the faith of Semion Petrovich, on his division of people into "the wicked" and "the conscientious," his belief that socialism could be built only by the hands of "righteous people," Lenin made some comment. It might be pertinent to record his words here, but I have forgotten them and, given Lenin's aversion to any kind of moralizing, I suppose that his remarks in this connection were of no particular interest. Otherwise I would surely have remembered them. I have the clearest recollection of everything else Lenin said in the course of that meeting, for it was then that my disagreement with him, which greatly upset and alarmed me, became manifest for the first time. I discovered that much as I admired Lenin as a great man, much as I felt drawn to him and eager to follow him, his attitude towards some most important issues strongly repelled me. I found that Lenin, while at odds with Plekhanov in matters of party politics, did not hesitate to take the latter's side against me in the field of philosophy, and this in a form that affected me most painfully.

"You told Plekhanov that materialism ought to be replaced by a certain variety of bourgeois philosophy. But this is nonsense, pernicious nonsense! Plekhanov was right, utterly right, in taking you to task at once. The Plekhanov who keeps company with

*These excerpts, describing the author's two conversations with Lenin in Geneva, in March and September, 1904, are translations from the author's book, *Vstrechi s Leninym*, N.Y., Chekhov Publishing House, 1953.

opportunists in the editorial office of the new *Iskra* should not be confused with the other Plekhanov, the best authority and the best commentator on Marxist philosophy since Engels. In a few sentences he has given you a trouncing, and it serves you right! But I didn't know; it's a big surprise to me that you too were given to amending Marx."

"Allow me to point out," I answered, "that Plekhanov called the theory of knowledge of Avenarius and Mach 'the cellar of bourgeois philosophy' without having taken the trouble of getting acquainted with it, without having read a single line by its authors. Such an attitude towards the scientific thought of others revolts me. It means passing sentence without trial."

"In the first place," Lenin continued, "I do not believe that Plekhanov actually has no knowledge of your philosophers; he keeps himself informed on philosophy. If he told you he was not acquainted with their writings, he probably did it to stress his contempt for them. In the second place, your indignation is unjustified. We know all too well by now what comes of the attempts to combine Marx with theories alien to him in spirit. Bernstein is an object-lesson, and so are our own Struve and Bulgakov. Struve began with amending Marxism and slid from there into the most vulgar stinking liberalism, and Bulgakov is on his way down to a still fouler pit. Marxism is a monolithic philosophy which does not tolerate dilution or vulgarization through petty additions and insertions. Plekhanov once said to me, in discussing some critic of Marxism, I have forgotten whom: 'First let's stick an ace of diamonds on him; we'll look into the matter later.'[1] Well, in my opinion we ought to pin an ace of diamonds on all those who attempt to shake Marxism, without even looking into their cases. Such should be the reaction of every sound revolutionary. When you find a stinking heap in your path, you don't have to dig your hands into it to know what it is, your nose will tell you it's dung, and you'll pass it by."

Lenin's words took my breath away.

"Out of Plekhanov's frying-pan I now fall into your fire," I brought out at last. "Plekhanov says that the philosophers Avenarius and Mach, although he has not read them, are 'witches,' and whether their eyes are red or yellow, does not interest him. And now our other theoretician, Lenin, recommends that we pin the badge of infamy on them without so much as attempting to explore

[1]A diamond-shaped badge sewn to the back of a convict's uniform in Tsarist prisons [Ed.].

their theories. You keep harping on one string—bourgeois philosophy, bourgeois philosophers. Yet the theory of Avenarius and Mach is anything but a metaphysical conception, it is an attempt to create a scientific theory of knowledge based on experience alone. Before stigmatizing it as criminal, make the effort to study and understand it. There is no such thing as a middle-class or working-class astronomy, algebra, physics, or chemistry. Nor is there a bourgeois theory of knowledge. All that matters is whether the theory of Avenarius and Mach is true or not. Even if it should contain some features typical of bourgeois mentality, it would be still inadmissible to brand its authors as criminals without proving them wrong. You mentioned Bulgakov. As a student at the Polytechnic I attended the seminar in economics he had organized for the benefit of students seeking a better acquaintance with social sciences than that afforded by the regular one-hour lectures in economics. Here we were given the opportunity to discuss a variety of problems with complete freedom. Bulgakov would open most of our meetings with the solemn reminder: 'Truth is attained through the honest, free, and loyal confrontation of ideas.' Frankly, I find this method more to my liking than your 'ace of diamonds.' "

"Oh, I see! So you attended Bulgakov's seminar? That's news. I don't congratulate you, no I don't. Isn't it perchance Bulgakov's influence that accounts for your inclination to correct the philosophy of Marx? That's a slippery path. The Social Democratic Party is not a seminar where various ideas are confronted. It is a militant class organization of the revolutionary proletariat. It has its own program and philosophy, a system of thought exclusively its own. Within the Party you cannot expect any particular freedom to criticize and to compare ideas. He who has joined the Party has to accept its ideas, has to share them, not tamper with them. If they don't satisfy him—well, the door is wide open, he is free to make his exit. We know all too well what lies behind this so-called 'freedom of criticism,' insisted upon not by the working-class element of the Party, but by the intellectuals in its ranks, infected with bourgeois prejudices. I say it again: 'Well done, Plekhanov!' He sensed at once that you had to be slapped down."

"Vladimir Ilich," I hastened to say, "I assure that I do not sympathize with revisionism in the least. The philosophy of Avenarius and Mach attracts me only because it shatters every kind of metaphysics in the most revolutionary way. Get acquainted with it and you will agree. But while I reject revisionism, I still do not think

that Marxism is a petrified system given once and for all and not subject to change. Plekhanov once wrote that Marxism was the absolute truth forever immune to change. What do you think of such a formula? How does it accord with dialectics?"

"I am in complete agreement with Plekhanov," Lenin stated, "Marx and Engels have outlined and said all that was to be said. If Marxism needs further development, it will have to be in the direction pointed out by its founders. Nothing in Marxism is subject to revision. There is only one answer to revisionism—a slap in the face! Neither the Marxist philosophy is subject to revision, nor the materialist conception of history, nor the idea of the inevitability of the social revolution, nor the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat—not a single one of the basic tenets of Marxism!"

This was my first disagreement with Lenin. The talk took place early in March. However, Lenin did not seem at the time to attach much importance to my outbursts during the encounter; after all, hadn't I protested again and again that I harbored no sympathy for revisionism? I still remained in his good graces. Only three and a half months later, when our differences had become acute and could no longer be overlooked, did he refer to that first dispute and use it as an additional argument for my relegation to the "enemy camp."

On the 16th, or possibly the 17th of September, a fellow Bolshevik who lived in my neighborhood let me know that Lenin wanted me to meet him that same evening at nine "at the usual place," the quai du Montblanc. I did not know what to make of it. It occurred to me that Lenin, following his philosophical controversy with Bogdanov, might have decided that, after all, this did not justify a break with him. Perhaps he planned to tell me the same thing. A glance at Lenin, when we met that night, dispelled this idea. With a cold spiteful face, scarcely taking time to greet me, he startled me with the question: "Do you *still* belong to our group?"

Oh! I thought, this "still" sounds like a challenge. I am not going to pretend that I don't catch on. I'll give him as good as I get. So I replied: "Yes, I have *not yet* left the majority group."

"So you have not yet left the group. I had to know this, for had you done it, I'd have turned my back on you without wasting another word. I do not ask you why you failed to sign the protest of the 37 Bolsheviks; I have been told that you had some kind of personal trouble just then."

"I lost my son."

"Whether this or something else was the real reason doesn't matter

much in this case. I intend to talk about more important matters. While you are still a member of the Bolshevik group, let me tell you that some things you have done are absolutely inadmissible."

What followed was a torrent of words poured forth in a fury, each with the intent of hurting and stinging. Today, after forty-eight years, I am still unable to think of it calmly. My wife who knew all my weaknesses well—my impulsiveness, my unpardonable propensity, when I was young, of having recourse to my fists (even to duelling, in my undergraduate days)—once told me that she was at a loss to understand how on this occasion I managed to refrain from assaulting Lenin or even from hurling him from the quai into Lake Geneva. She observed that it showed how strong was his hypnotic hold on me.

"Many people, and I in particular," Lenin began, "are aware that for a long time you have been planning to return to Russia. For this you need money, a passport, and underground connections in places other than Kiev, where you are too well known to show up. You have neither the one, nor the other, nor the third. And so, in order to get what you need, you started a campaign of wooing first me, then Pavlovich (Krassikov) and Bonch-Bruevich. And now I've got wind that at the same time and for the same end you have been running after the Mensheviks. This is how you reasoned: 'If I fail to get the money and the papers from the Bolsheviks, I'll try to obtain them from the Mensheviks. If in return they ask for any pledges and declarations, well, I'll sign them.' I call this the vilest, foulest double-dealing, this shifting from one camp to another, one foot here, the other there. Such conduct deserves nothing but contempt."

Beside myself, I shouted: "All this is a filthy lie!"

"The whole point is that it is not a lie. You began by making advances to that moron Martynov, who even filched all kinds of documents from *Iskra* for you, and then through him you managed to sneak into the very center of Menshevism and started toadying to Martov: 'Let me have a passport and some dough, and I'm ready to desert Lenin and the Bolsheviks.' "

"It's all a lie, an outrageous fabrication!"

"It's you who are lying. Can you deny that you met Martov?"

"What of it? Is a meeting with Martov, your close comrade of not so long ago, such a disgraceful thing as to be branded 'double-dealing'? I never sought to meet Martov, it happened by accident, and ever since I've had no dealings either with him or with any

other Mensheviks. Not a word passed between us regarding Party matters, or a passport, and least of all money."

"And what, if I may ask, did you discuss with Martov—the weather, I suppose?"

"We talked about philosophy, and nothing else."

"And why, having arranged a meeting with Martov (it was not accidental, of that I am sure!), didn't you talk about Party affairs of interest to all, and did you discuss philosophy instead, in which Martov, as I well know, takes very little interest? Maybe all you wanted was to weep on Martov's shoulder, complaining of that brute of a Lenin who has given your philosophers a whipping? One thing is sure, if indeed you had a philosophical discussion with Martov it was meant only as bait."

Without letting me put in a word, Lenin went on reiterating with variations the same accusations of double-dealing and trying "to wangle a wretched passport and cash" by dubious means. And yet Lenin had always encouraged his followers to go back to Russia. He was aware that many of them would have been glad to settle abroad for good and were by no means in a hurry to exchange the safety of Geneva for the underground in Russia, with a false passport and the constant threat of imprisonment. But now, in my own case, he was giving the matter a strange twist. He spoke of my desire to go back as of something shameful, revealing me in the worst possible light. For some reason it meant duplicity and bad faith. No longer trusting me, he apparently believed that once back in Russia, in possession of papers and money supplied by the Bolsheviks, I would turn my coat and go over to the Mensheviks. He accused me of having repaid the confidence the Bolsheviks had shown me by "spreading slander about them." But when I urged him to tell me what slander, he answered: "You were chummy with Martov; you met him, didn't you? Who can believe that in this nice company you refrained from malicious gossip about the Bolsheviks?"

I was so dumbfounded by the flood of unexpected and undeserved accusations that under their impact I lost all ability to defend myself. This was taken by Lenin as an admission of guilt and spurred him on to ever more virulent attacks. But after a while I recovered and took the offensive myself. I pointed out to him that I had come to Geneva not because it had been my wish but because Krzyzanovsky on behalf of the Central Committee had ordered me abroad; and that now it was up to the same Committee to enable me to go back. "Some minor expenditure incurred in my behalf by the Bol-

sheviks does not turn me into their property. It is inconceivable that the group should give me the means to return to Russia only on condition that I remain well-behaved. I have no intention of being stuck in Geneva to the end of time, and, though up to now nothing has ever been said about it, if you refuse to help me, I shall appeal to the minority for assistance."

To this Lenin replied: "What you have just said makes it plain that from the point of view of the majority, the money spent on you has not paid off."

I reminded Lenin that X, a member of the Bolshevik group, after having been provided with a passport and funds for his return to Russia, had, on his way there, squandered the money in drunken orgies in the brothel of a big city and never reached his destination. "And what was your attitude then?" I asked. "You declared, I heard you myself, that since you were not a priest, preaching sermons was not your business, and you were inclined to wink at the whole matter. With such a moral sense, or rather lack of it, what right have you to lecture me about my 'shameful, unworthy' conduct? Your sermonizing is all the more outrageous because it is based on trumped-up charges."

"You want to know what right I have?" Lenin asked. "This is not a question of right as understood by popish morality but a political right, a right derived from class and party. I'll try to explain to you what is at issue. You, very probably, would never have gone to that brothel, and certainly you would never spend Party money on drink. So far as I know, you have no weakness for liquor. But you are apt to do things that are much worse. You are capable of intriguing with Martynov, an inveterate enemy of our orthodox revolutionary old *Iskra.* You are capable of approving the reactionary bourgeois theory of Mach, a foe of materialism. You are capable of admiring the alleged 'quest for truth' of Bulgakov. All this adds up to a brothel many times worse than the whorehouse with the naked tarts visited by X. Your brothel poisons and obscures the class consciousness of the workers; and if we are to judge your conduct and that of X from this point of view, the only correct one for a Social Democrat, we shall arrive at different conclusions. You deserve to be held up to shame for trying to substitute an obscure theory for Marxism; while the offense of X may be easily condoned. As a Party man X is a steadfast seasoned revolutionary; he has proved himself a staunch *Iskra* man before the congress, during the congress, after the congress, and this is of primary importance,

whatever the Axelrods may babble. If he went to that brothel, it surely was a case of need; and it shows a complete loss of the sense of the ridiculous to sermonize about a matter of physiology. By the way, in dragging in the X story, you are not very original. Consorting with Martov has already had its effect on you, you follow the path trodden by Martov, Zasulich, Potresov, who went into hysterics, about two years ago, on account of some facts concerning the private life of comrade B.[2] I told them then and there: 'B is a highly useful man, devoted to the revolution and the Party, and as to the rest, I don't give a damn.' "

"It follows from your words," I observed, "that no infamy is to be condemned if it is committed by a man useful to the Party. From this it is one step to Raskolnikov's 'all is allowed.' "

"What Raskolnikov?"

"The hero of Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment.*"

Lenin stopped short, pushed his thumbs behind the lapels of his waistcoat and gave me a look of undisguised contempt. " 'All is allowed!' Sooner or later we were bound to come upon them, the mawkish sentiments and pet formulas of flabby intellectuals, ever ready to drown the issues of party and revolution in sanctimonious vomit. Well, which Raskolnikov do you have in mind, the one who butchered the vile old pawnbroker hag, or the one who later banged his head against the ground in a fit of penitential hysteria? Maybe you, as one who attended Bulgakov's seminar, have a preference for the latter?"

His persistent sneering at my relations with Bulgakov made me lose my temper. "After what you have said," I shouted, "it is easy to guess that it was you who started the slanderous gossip about my alleged adherence to the views of Bulgakov. The method you are using to discredit me is utterly dishonest. I have told you again and again that I do not subscribe to any of Bulgakov's religious, philosophical, or sociological opinions. And yet in complete disregard of this you unscrupulously persist in representing me as a follower of Bulgakov." I pointed out to Lenin that he was making a political crime out of a friendly relationship based upon the gratitude of a university student to a talented teacher, to whom all his listeners owed a great deal. In pronouncing the words "Bulgakov's seminar," Lenin used a special tone, as though making them mean some kind of religious seminary affiliated with a theological academy and

[2]Lenin named him, but I do not wish to cite the name. The facts Lenin referred to are not known to me.

devoted to the study of canonical problems, instead of a group of students writing and hearing papers on Marx, Kautsky, Mikhailovsky, Kant, Spencer, and so on. Lenin's habit, I told him, of indiscriminately sticking labels on people whose thinking differed from his own, linking them with the names now of Voroshilov, now of Akimov, Bulgakov, or Martynov, was beginning to nauseate me. For the last six years I had lived in close association with various revolutionary circles, and never yet had I anywhere observed such unsavory ways of settling accounts, such sickening polemical methods, such foul play, as were rampant in the Party milieu of Geneva. Here all was considered fair in a fight. "And you, Comrade Lenin, instead of trying to check this evil, encourage it by your own example."

Lenin exclaimed: "Until now I thought I was dealing with an adult, but now I look at you and I ask myself, are you really a child, or are you pretending to be one for some reasons of your own, probably of a highly moral kind? So you find it sickening that the tone within the Party is less refined than that of a young ladies' finishing school? That's an old song, dear to those who would like to turn revolutionary fighters into milksops. God forbid that you offend Ivan Ivanovich by some rash word! For heaven's sake don't hurt the feelings of Piotr Petrovich! Kowtow to each other even when you disagree! Well, if we Social Democrats were to use only toothless inoffensive words in our politics, propaganda, agitation, polemics, we should be no better than those dreary pastors who preach futile sermons every Sunday."

Lenin went on, relating with great gusto what a master of invective Marx had been, how effectively the latter's son-in-law, Lafargue, used abusive language, how French politicians in general excelled in this field—they knew "how to smear an opponent's mug in such a way that he couldn't wash it clean for a long time."

"No," I said, "we have nothing to learn from the French in this respect. To crush a political opponent, and be it an old Party comrade, we have the ace of diamonds. I have not forgotten how swiftly I was relegated by you to the category of your worst enemies and what a flood of abuse you poured upon my head as soon as you learned that I did not share all your views in the field of philosophy."

"You're right in this, you're absolutely right. All those who give up Marxism are my enemies, I refuse to shake hands with them, and I do not sit down at the same table with the Philistines."

The reference to "giving up Marxism" led to a renewed phil-

osophical argument, almost a repetition of the scene at the rue du Foyer in March; but I shall not dwell on this. From nine to eleven that evening we were pacing up and down the quai du Montblanc. "It is time to part," I was thinking. "There is nothing to talk about any more," Lenin anticipated me. "I break off the discussion and am going home. The argument has not been altogether fruitless, it has made many things clear to me. It goes without saying that you will not stay in our organization, but even if you should, do not count on my cooperation in any way, in particular in the matter of your return to Russia."

Without shaking hands, Lenin turned his back on me and walked away.

I soon left the Bolshevik organization.

Faith and Reason in Russian History

By Valentine Tschebotarioff Bill

Faith and Reason—What images and concepts do these abstract words convey to us?

When we speak of Faith, in our Western world, we think of the Christian religion. We see before us the Cross, or perhaps a church steeple, or a congregation kneeling in prayer. When we speak of Reason, we think of science, or philosophy, we see before us an open book, or a test tube, or perhaps a library, or a class room of students bent over their books. In short, Faith and Reason stand for the life of the Spirit and the life of the Mind—the two spheres of life through which Man rose above the animal world.

In the history of Western Europe, these two spheres have clashed and conflicted, but also sought to complement one another, to blend, to reach a harmonious relationship. Christianity in Western Europe followed upon the Age of Antiquity, the Age of Greek and Roman thought, and was, in turn, succeeded by the Age of the Renaissance and Reformation, in which Reason reasserted itself. And if then, the Industrial Revolution tipped the scales markedly in favor of Reason, we may well stand, in our lifetime, on the threshold of a new age of compromise between rational and spiritual values.

What was, in comparison, the relationship of Mind and Spirit in the course of Russian history?

The first fundamental difference between the course of events in Russia and in Europe is the fact that Christianity did not grow in Russia on the ruins of an older civilization, as it did in the West, but was brought to a group of primitive Slav tribes in the early beginnings of Russian history.

Christianity, in the form of the Greek Orthodox religion, was introduced to Russia from Byzantium in the tenth century. Moreover, this introduction was carried out forcibly, from above, through the deliberate choice of the ruling prince who was the first to adopt the new religion. From the top of the social structure, Christianity was then transmitted downward through a decree ordering compulsory baptism of the entire population. This meant a process diametrically opposed to the evolution of the Christian creed in Western Europe, where it grew slowly and freely from below, gradually displacing paganism in the upper layers of society.

A far-reaching consequence of the abrupt and compulsory introduction of Christianity from the top in Russia was, inevitably, a mixture of Christian precepts and pagan rites and superstitions in the lower strata of society—inevitably, since the masses were forced to adopt the new religion. This mixture of Christian and pagan persisted for many centuries to come.

However, the following centuries brought a more rapid dissemination of Christianity among the Russian people than one would expect considering its forceful introduction. This was principally due to the calamity of the Tartar invasion which befell Russia in the thirteenth century. Russia was devastated, conquered, and incorporated into the vast Mongol Empire founded by Genghis Khan and expanded by his descendants. For the following two and a half centuries Russia bore the yoke of Asiatic despotism. The human losses, material destruction, loss of political independence, the heavy burden of tribute payments born at the hands of the Tartars brought it about that the thoughts and energies of the Russian people were drawn more and more toward religion. The hope of another world, another life hereafter held up by the church, inspired the people to endure all the misfortunes crowding their path on this earth. It is now that the Russian church music comes to bloom, now that prayers like "Lord have mercy upon us" acquire such urgency and vivid immediate implications. It is now that Russian icon painting comes to bloom, breaking away from the Byzantine tradition and developing its own indigenous art, with original use of color and highly artistic composition. It is now that monasteries by the score spring up in the northern districts of Russia, where a secluded life of prayer and meditation could be pursued.

And yet, in spite of deepening piety, the realm of superstitions, of wonders and fancies remained untouched. The Russian people had become intensely religious, but had remained ignorant. The ideals held up to them were the ideals of moral perfection. But little was done to improve their mind, their intellect, their power of reasoning. The dark powers of Nature seemed to loom all around them, unconquered and incomprehensible. So it happened that the sufferings inflicted by the Tartars prompted people not only to retreat into the realm of religion, but also into the realm of fancy.

The age of the Tartar yoke was not only an age of prayers, but also an age of dreams. People retreated from reality not only into the sphere of pious meditation, but also into the land of magic and wonders, weaving golden threads of fairy tales. So, the centuries of

subjugation by the Tartars were not only an age of prayer, of church music, of icon painting, of monasteries, but also an age of fairy tales. It is now that the Russian fairy tale comes to bloom. The close association, in the minds of the Russian people, of the Divine and the Fanciful, of religion and superstition, of moral precepts and magic formulas, continues.

In the latter part of the fifteenth century, the Russians, under Moscow's leadership, succeeded in freeing themselves from the Tartar yoke. There arose the State of Muscovy—free and independent, but isolated from Europe, ignorant of the great cultural experiences which the West had passed through while Russia bore the Tartar yoke and emerged from the ordeal. In sixteenth century Muscovy, Faith still reigned supreme. It was now a rigid, ritualistic mould, untempered by any degree of educational, intellectual advancement. The educational ideal in Muscovy was the teaching of how to live like a good Christian, not of how to think. Wisdom was measured in terms of charitable acts and moral excellence, and was not related to the accumulation and assimilation of knowledge. Reading and writing were considered as a technique, a skill needed for certain professions, but not as a tool of general education and mental discipline.

For the peasantry, which comprised the vast majority of the Russian population, the church was still the only center of spiritual light. In the dreary life of the peasant, the church provided a combination of classroom, concert hall, and art gallery. It was a classroom where the peasant learned the principles of Christian conduct. It was not an institution where he learned to think.

The dominant place held by the church ritual in the imagination of the rural population was a dangerous supremacy, because it prevented the peasant from discriminating between the formal word, letter, gesture of the ceremony and their meaning. People were unable to distinguish church rites from doctrine, symbolism from reality, the irrelevant from the essential. And since, in his primitive ways of living, the peasant still lived in constant fear of the dark and unconquered powers of Nature, the church ritual assumed the power of a magic formula—along with hundreds of different superstitious charms and spells. The church ritual, to the peasant, was a strong and universal charm, equally effective as a passport to heaven and as a weapon to disperse ghosts and apparitions. Like every magic formula, religious rites had to be preserved intact in every detail in order to retain their power.

By the middle of the seventeenth century, this popular misconception bore disastrous results. This was the time when Muscovy began to be interested in the European world. In keeping with this general beginning trend, Patriarch Nikon ordered a revision of Russian church books and prayer texts, meant to correct errors which had slipped in during the centuries of separation of the Russian Church from the Greek orthodox metropolis of Constantinople. A series of simple changes in the details of the Russian church ritual was decided upon by the Patriarch. For instance, Alleluia was to be recited three times instead of twice in certain parts of the service; and the congregation was to make the sign of the cross with three joined fingers instead of two. Yet such simple changes struck at the core of what the masses cherished and clung to in their superstitious fear of the unconquered powers of nature. The magic formula of the church ritual was to be changed. The spell would break. There would be nothing to hold back the dark forces of nature. They would all break loose and engulf mankind. The end of the world would come. In fierce and desperate protest, the masses rose to defend the Old Faith, led by numerous members of the lower clergy. Popular uprisings in the name of the Old Belief had to be put down by force of arms in the capital as well as in the remotest parts of Muscovy. Yet the Old Believers were never an organized movement with a definite program of action; they remained a primitive elemental mass of rebels, passionate but immature. Old Believers dispersed all over the country, built new communities wherever old ways of worship would be maintained.

Although the Old Believers emphasized the ritualistic side of religion, they were, nevertheless, the most fervent elements among Russian parishioners. Those Russians joined the ranks of the Old Believers who cared most about their religion. Thus, a large section of the best elements of the Russian Orthodox community seceded from the official church. At the end of the nineteenth century, this section was estimated to be composed of several million people. Those who remained within the fold of the church were, largely, the passive, submissive, unresponsive elements. The inner strength of the official church, its spiritual vitality, was seriously impaired by the secession of the Old Believers. This, no less than the growing state interference in church affairs, prompted Dostoevsky to speak of the "paralysis" of the Russian church. Thus Faith played a leading, but tragic rôle, in Russian history. It became deep, sincere, but it never matured, it was never aided, supported, strengthened by

mental discipline, interpretation, and examination. It thus grew into an inflexible, rigid, and yet fragile mould, which was fatally damaged by the blow of simple ritualistic reforms.

What, then, was the rôle of Reason in Russian history? While speaking of the age of the Tartar yoke, it was possible to speak of the spiritual life of the Russian people as a whole. The fatal church schism of the seventeenth century, however, affected the peasant world primarily and proved largely an experience which concerned the lower classes. This is in part due to the fact that the time of the church schism, which affected the masses, was also the time of beginning intellectual education, which affected the upper class.

Both the crisis of the Russian Faith and the initial appearance of Reason on the stage of Russian history, stemmed from the same source—the as yet hesitant, but undeniable desire of Muscovy to come closer to Europe, to catch up with the cultural superiority of the West. This desire initiated the revision of church books, which led to the schism, and this desire also led the Muscovite state to open a Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy in Moscow, where youths from among the upper social stratum were taught Latin, Greek, grammar, logic, and rhetoric in preparation for future state service. This was the first attempt to train the crude intellect of upper-class Muscovites, an attempt which did not develop spontaneously among the upper class out of a desire to improve the mind, but an attempt which was sponsored by the state, introduced from above. This governmental guidance, initiative, and supervision of the intellectual development of the Russian aristocracy continued for a century and a half. And since Russia was an autocracy, the personal predilections and interests of each successive sovereign in power during that time determined the choice of fields, the choice of directions, in which the education of the aristocracy was steered. And since the personalities of the sovereigns who occupied Russia's throne during that time greatly varied in character and interests, the outstanding feature of Russia's educational trends were its continuous, repeated changes—changes in ideals, requirements, and methods. Each generation of Russian nobles was taught in its youth in a manner and in fields which it found useless once it grew to manhood and entered upon its careers.

Peter the Great, in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, expected his nobles to acquire a practical, scientific education. But the nobles educated under the old scholastic system of the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy had no conception of the sciences of medicine,

navigation, mechanics, or mathematics, and were sent abroad to acquire laboriously the required knowledge.

Toward the middle of the eighteenth century, under Peter's niece and later under his daughter, the interest of court circles in this practical knowledge waned. Noblemen were now expected to exhibit a purely formal polish of manners—to know how to dance, how to dress, how to converse, how to live a life of leisure. Nobles educated under Peter the Great were out of place. In the later part of the eighteenth century, under Catherine II, France, with its culture, wit, and enlightenment became "the Fatherland of the heart and of the soul" for Russian nobles. The supremacy of French culture and language pushed, in the minds of the Russian aristocracy, all things Russian into the background.

Yet, under Alexander I, in the early part of the nineteenth century, occurred hostilities with France and the Napoleonic invasion. The idol of the preceding generation was defeated by Russia. With it, the blind admiration for French culture came to an end. Realization grew among the Russian nobility that Russia was the only country where the educated class did not speak its native language and did not know its native country. From the desire to know Russia better to the desire to improve Russian life, there was but a short step. A small group among the nobility took that step in the early part of the nineteenth century. Thus, the Russian intelligentsia was born—a group of men aspiring to independent and reformatory thinking, free from governmental supervision, in fierce opposition to it. This group of men grew in size as the nineteenth century went on, complemented by members of the middle classes. To them all, thinking became an intoxicating experience, almost as important as living itself. Dostoevsky has given us a vivid picture of these trends in his major novels, in which the heroes' fate hinges on ideas alone. It is ideas which bring salvation to some and again ideas which lead others to their doom.

This can only be understood in the light of Russia's spiritual and intellectual past. First, the long centuries in which mental exercise was excluded from the field of education and Faith held the dominant place in people's minds, must be recalled. And secondly, the century and a half must be remembered, during which governmental initiative and directives, continuously shifting and contradicting one another, prescribed to the educated part of society what to think and how to live. When now, in the nineteenth century, Russians began, for the first time in their long history, to think and to think

independently from the state, in bitter opposition to the state, their thinking retained the historical Russian element of Faith and lacked a stable, solid intellectual foundation on which to build and to grow.

Total devotion to an idea, not admitting any doubts, reservations, qualifications, or revisions became the first characteristic trait of Russian thought. The function of scepticism, of objectivity, of dispassionate analysis remained a thing unknown. If life, facts, reality, proved an idea wrong, it was discarded as emphatically and fiercely as it had been previously wholeheartedly and passionately adopted. Thus spectacular shifts and changes in prevailing ideas became the second outstanding feature of Russian thought.

In the 1840's the school of Westerners preached the value and dignity of the human individual and glorified the European culture which had produced it. At the same time, the Slavophiles idealized the Russian peasant, Russia's past, and prophesied the Messianic mission of Russia in world history. In the 1860's, the Nihilists rebelled against such abstract speculations and swung toward the practical activity of sweeping Russia clean of the debris of feudalism and serfdom. "What can be destroyed—should be destroyed" they thundered, "only what withstands the blow is worth preserving. What falls to pieces is rubbish. In any case, strike to the right and to the left, it will do no harm."

This destructive mood of the 1860's gave way, in the seventies, to a constructive attitude. A penitent intelligentsia, feeling its isolation on lofty pinnacles of extreme ideas, attempted to bridge the precipice which separated it from the peasantry. The intelligentsia felt guilty, indebted to the peasant. Filled with remorse, eager to repay its debt, scores of intellectuals invaded the village in the capacity of doctors, nurses, teachers, or laborers, trying to improve living conditions of the peasantry and to rouse it from its apathy. But they were met with cold indifference at best and with open hostility more than once. This is the moment when the intelligentsia turned its back on the peasantry and transferred its attention to the Industrial Worker. It is against this background that Marxism made its appearance in Russia.

The Spirit of the New Soviet Middle Class*

By Vera Sandomirsky

In spite of controls and propagandistic purposes, Soviet fiction to some extent *does* reflect the "living life" of the Soviet Union. Some facets of that literature seem to be truthful. Some authors seem to be more truthful than others; women more than men, Leningrad writers more than the Moscow group, writers devoting themselves to the small forms more than those with *War and Peace* ambitions, those writing their first books more than the old hands. They *seem* to be more truthful. Any analytical reading from long distance is done through the prism of the observer's intuition; therefore, this brief sketch of some post-war middle-class values, like most attempts at interpreting Soviet fiction, is largely speculative.

There are several traits and trends that distinguish post-1946 Soviet fiction from that of earlier periods. As is well known, the failure to produce a credible and lifelike positive hero is one of them. The corollary success of so-called negative characters who persistently turn out to be quite attractive, is another. To the great chagrin of the taskmasters in the Department of Propaganda and Agitation, the division between angels and devils has become a little vague. This is, perhaps, related to an important phenomenon which reveals itself in a less overt fashion; namely, a curious atmosphere of ideological double-talk which envelops most of the post-war literary output. And the more ambitious in size and scope a novel is, the more readily it betrays the confusion in values with which the young generation is being indoctrinated. It is striking to what an extent the spirit of *meshchanstvo*, the spirit of the new Soviet middle class permeates these novels. It seems to be more than a disconnected series of inadvertent slips on the part of the Soviet authors. In certain of its aspects, meshchanstvo has apparently been sanctioned from above and these sanctions have been largely responsible for the confusion on the ideological front.

In the past, in the twenties and thirties, the directives to indoc-

*Paper read at the Conference of American and Canadian Slavicists, University of Michigan, June 1953 [Ed.].

trinate youth with collective values were relatively clear and streamlined. And the proletarian writers at least, if not others, executed the directives no less clearly. There was hardly any confusion about the message which typical heroes of those astoundingly faraway days represented. One need only recall, for instance, Dasha Chumalova, the new woman of the mid-twenties in Fyodor Gladkov's *Cement*, or Pavel Korchagin, the new man of the mid-thirties, in Nikolai Ostrovsky's *The Tempering of Steel*, and the considerable amount of ascetic collectivism they stood for. The noticeable confusion today, the implicit two-sidedness of the sermon, results, in all probability, from the disintegration of collective values with which youth is supposed to be imbued. One is inclined to suspect that the distintegration takes place not on the lowly level of the subservient novelist, but much higher up in the hierarchy. The more these values tacitly collapse, the louder they are extolled, but the decay is noticeable just the same.

Careerism, plain and simple, practiced passionately on an individual basis, emerges as one of the main themes. Even though the more extreme and unpalatable manifestations of careerism are castigated, a considerable amount of it, a certain "proper" way of becoming somebody is not only acceptable but desirable. The term for this going up process is *probivatsya v liudi*, that is to push ahead in order to become part of the respected people, part of those who have arrived in the Soviet rather exhibitionist society. It is remarkable in this connection that the term *prostoi rabochii* (simple worker) has distinctly become an insult.

As one of a multitude of examples, here is a crack young factory worker, a Stakhanovite, his chest beribboned and bemedalled, sitting in a resplendent penthouse restaurant in Moscow with his girl friend. She asks a pertinent question:

> Venzova: . . . Tell me, what are you trying to achieve in life? What do you want to become?
>
> Nikolai: What do I want to become? How do you mean it? I don't want to become anything. I am a worker and I want to be a worker.
>
> Venzova: What nonsense! You are an intelligent, capable fellow. Why shouldn't you study?
>
> Nikolai: I do study. My sister and I are in the fourth year of a technical school . . . I do it by correspondence.
>
> Venzova: So, I am right then? It would be stupid for you to remain a simple worker.[1]

[1]Alexander Kron, "Kandidat Partii" (Party Candidate), *Novyi Mir*, 10, 1950, p. 19.

How the proper process of social ascent is to be sanctioned in terms of traditional Bolshevik collective values is not quite clear. But then lack of clarity in important formative matters is an intrinsic part of current Soviet ideology. This is precisely the source of double-talk in the field of rationalization about values. This is also the source of double-talk in the message of post-war creative literature. That in real life, which that literature never portrays candidly and directly, the emergence of careerism is an old and well-understood phenomenon is another matter altogether. What else could sharply differentiated materialistic incentives for individual exertion have produced in the course of so many years? But the system, at least verbally, still clings to the ideal of collectivism. This creates confusion. And the mix-up, obviously, engulfs some ranks of the rulers. Those who receive and those who dispense villas, automobiles, medals, orders, and ribbons are far removed from the ideal of the original commune.

Post-war careerism stems to a considerable degree from the Soviet neo-lower-middle-class spirit. And one cannot be too sure that the word "lower" is not misleading. Perhaps, suppressing one's desire for sociological precision, one should simply call the matrix of that spirit meshchanstvo or *Spiessbuergertum* or whatever else one may think of, so long as the term stresses the spirit of certain values rather than their class origin. For meshchanstvo as an attitude, or rather as a homogeneous cluster of attitudes, can occur on any landing of the social structure so long as there is within that social structure a climbable staircase, no matter how steep. In some of its aspects meshchanstvo is almost synonymous with the *arrivisme* of the newly rich, wherever they may pop up. A Vice-Admiral of the Soviet Navy as well as a post office clerk can be afflicted with it, not to speak, of course, of their wives. Phoniness is an important ingredient of that spirit. And it certainly has something to do with material acquisitions through which the newly-arrived tries to impress the not-yet-arrived. The phoniness emerges most visibly in the endowment of material acquisitions with spiritual qualities. A cozy little home with geraniums on the window sills and a white individualistic fence around it or a *Pobeda* with or without chauffeur have become not only symbols but tangible proof of Stalinist and post-Stalinist valor.

As an illustration of how immediately that valor is translated into material privileges and how quickly these privileges are retranslated into things of the spirit, here is another young Stakhanovite in a Ural industrial town at the moment of his promotion. On the basis

of his spectacular speed-up achievements, he has become an assistant foreman. At this glorious moment of his life, Dimitri is called into the director's office. The latter acts like a benign fortuna, conjuring out of his horn of plenty wonderful things. It didn't occur to the director to ask the question of questions earlier, but now he does:

> "How are your living conditions?"
>
> Dimitri became embarrassed. "I live at my uncle's. He has an *individualnyi domik*."
>
> "Are you married?"
>
> "No . . . that is, not yet. I would have liked to ask you for a room . . ."
>
> "We will give you a room indeed!" Stepan Ivanovich pressed a button and asked that Khromov, the trade union representative, be summoned to his office. . . "Requisition a house for Artiomov's disposal at once. Prepare the papers for a sales contract with him. He will be able to pay ten thousand rubles down payment right away because he is going to receive a premium for his invention. The rest we will allow him on mortgage."
>
> Together with Khromov, Dimitri took off to legalize the request for the house, the mortgage, the contract, the payments. "Well, there you are! A homeowner!" said Khromov handing over to Dimitri copies of papers signed by him. "Let us now do something about your furniture."
>
> He took a pen and began to fill out a document for the release of furniture from the warehouse of the plant administration. Homeowner . . . How the sense of this old word has changed! Homeowners in Rudnogorsk were now the best Stakhanovites and engineers. Dimitri wanted very badly to go together with Marina, his fiancée, to look at their new home, but the hour was late. His dreams carried him together with her into their own house, their own new house where they will begin their life together. For some reason he imagined that the walls still smelled of moist plaster and the shiny floors of oil paint. The windows opened into the garden. In spring they will be able to plant trees. Marina will sow flowers . . . hollyhock, stock, night beauty, and petunias. . . .[3]

Touching meditation, what with the mingled scents of fresh oil paints and petunias. Daydreaming is a most infrequent event on the pages of Soviet fiction and night dreams are almost altogether absent. When they do occur, their message is, as a rule, weighty. Not that there is anything special in this petunia, the ubiquitous petty bourgeois flower the world over. Just because of that, one might be even tempted to mellow and rejoice over the author's inadvertent admission that Stakhanovites are much like dwellers in any suburbia. The similarity, however, is only superficial. For there is a difference between a Western bourgeois petunia blossoming as a reality of the comforts of middle-class existence and the Soviet one which, due to the low standard of living, is in all likelihood rarely planted in cozy

[3]Pavel Shebunin, "Stakhanovtsi" (Stakhanovites), *Novyi Mir*, 7, 1950, p. 182.

white-fenced gardens, but rather functions as a symbol of middle-class aspirations. The Soviet petunia is not reality but a project. More than that, it has *qua* project some sort of emotional value. Outside of fiction, there are as yet few comfortable new little homes surrounded by petunias. That this is what one *might* achieve as a totally satisfying reward with due exertion is the message of the fragrant petunia symbol.

All this might bring one to the consideration of how "full and beautiful life" shapes up under post-war conditions. Revealing information in concentrated doses can be gathered from Surkov's Stalin prize play *Rassvet nad Moskvoi* (Dawn over Moscow), 1950. The central figure in it is a rather autocratic lady of over forty, an energetic, dedicated Party member of old vintage. It ought to be mentioned that Party members of this particular ripe age bracket are exceedingly vulnerable and are subjected, as a rule, because of some of their beliefs which have in official estimation become obsolete, to a great deal of criticism. Thus, this lady is presented as a *negative* character because she clashes with a number of manifestations of the newly defined "beautiful life."

The conflict in the play is simple enough. Kapitolina Solntseva exerts herself to the utmost to overfulfill her norm in textile production. It is true that her inordinate efforts produce what is known as *shirpotreb*, mass consumption goods, which in their esthetic quality nauseate not only the consumer but the vice minister of the textile industry himself. But her position is stubborn and militant. She claims with astounding frankness that the masses lack basic clothing and that the immediate goal should be to provide them with cheap and practical fabrics. Under the leadership of the plant's Party organizer, a group of enlightened and advanced engineers and workers, those who know what "beautiful life" is supposed to be, prepare to unseat the obstreperous lady director. Their counterplan, for which they receive encouragement from the ministery of textile industries, calls for adorning the fabrics with patterns "bright, beautiful . . . joyful, like a ray of morning dawn . . . like a good song" so that these fabrics may bloom "like a meadow in the spring." In their ardent search for beautification, they, naturally enough, turn to copying designs and patterns of Russian nunnery lace and of other patriotic sources. Solntseva resists these beauty reforms throughout. She bluntly refuses to work for the taste of "merchants' wives" whom she had considered extinct.

Not that Solntseva is not broken in the last scene of the last act.

But till then she defends her values stoically. Her most important defect, the one which more than anything else makes her a negative character, is that she is single. *Lichnaya neustroennost*, a failure to arrange one's personal life, is a grievous sin. Her husband was killed during the war. She herself fought all through the war in Kovpak's partisan army. Nonetheless, it is held against her that she insists on remaining single particularly since a suitable suitor is available. This man, whom she staunchly rejects, raises silver foxes, of the blue, aristocratic variety, in faraway Siberia. He keeps flying in from his remote lands to woo the obstreperous widow. When once in an enticing gesture he drapes one of his blue foxes around her directorial shoulders with the words, "Look, Kapa, the pride of Siberian lands!" her reaction is anything but gratitude.

> "You are laughing at me, Anton! A woman partisan, and in fur stoles! . . . Offer it to some *fifa!* [equivalent of dame or babe]
>
> The suitor is deeply hurt. "It is not for *fifas* that we are raising such animals. It is not for them that Siberia sends such gifts."
>
> "I can't understand you men! You, Anton, raise blue foxes. My *partorg* dreams of bright rags. Under the pretext that it's all for us, for Soviet women. But did you ask us, us Soviet women whether we want it? All we needed are these blue foxes and bright rags!"[3]

Obviously she is a purist. And as such she has become inflexible. She stands close to the edge of the dreaded *otryv*, that is divorce from the desires of the collectivity as they are being shaped from above. She fails to be constructively enthusiastic about Stalin's famous post-war appeal to textile workers: "Dress our Soviet women like princesses and let the whole world admire them!"

What does all this have to do with the inventory of meshchanstvo? Directly, not much, but indirectly, a great deal. To be sure, the understandable effort on the part of the government to improve the quality of mass consumption goods cannot be directly equated with what we may think are the spreading values of the middle class.

But, for one thing, it is curious that Solntseva's stubborn lack of understanding of the acuteness of the beautification problem is rooted in a psychological anti-middle-class attitude. She seems incapable of understanding the political significance of the tastes of the "merchants' wives." Bright fabrics, permanents, and individualistic petunias, replace the collection values of twenty, or even

[3]Anatolii Surov, "Rassvet nad Moskvoi" (Dawn over Moscow), *Oktiabr*, 1, 1950, p. 136.

ten years ago. These things, approved from above, have become political values for the young to aspire to.

The people's expectations of post-war rewards included above all else expectations of a higher standard of living. A "full and beautiful life" to most indeed means better fabrics, better shoes, better housing. This is painfully obvious. Mass expectations of such things, however, is one thing and an enforced equation of "full and beautiful life" with a gay fabric is quite another. The régime is thus sanctioning widely spread middle-class values. And the sad part about the whole thing is that it is still a dream and a promise. A promised petunia, whether in a little garden or on a cotton fabric, at the expense of freedom, is a rather sordid flower.

As another illustration of the collapse of some of the traditional Bolshevik values and of the confusion that arises from it, a dispute between two young people may be cited. A veteran who is now a student, a young man to whom the war experience has been significant and formative, is trying to discover what the post-war girl he has fallen in love with stands for and what she expects of life.

> "Lena," said Vadim, "why do you study in the pedagogical institute and not at the conservatory?"
>
> "Vadim, you don't understand! How could I have enrolled at the conservatory when my voice was not yet discovered? You don't discover these things at once, you know. And then . . . do you think it's easy to be admitted at the conservatory? It's not so easy. And what's more, I don't need it. I don't study singing to make it my profession."
>
> "What for, then?"
>
> "For . . ." Lena turned silent for a second and then uttered with her habitual sententiousness: "A woman, Vadim, must know everything. She must know how to dress, how to sing, how to be beautiful—you understand?"
>
> "I understand. So, it follows that you study to become a woman?"
>
> Lena looked at Vadim with silent outrage . . . And suddenly he could not control himself: "And what is your goal, Lena?"
>
> "What goal, Vadim?" she asked softly and with surprise.
>
> "Of your life."
>
> "What, what?" She suddenly burst out laughing. "Is this some sort of public inspection? Or a parlor game? My God, what loud words—'goal in life'! We got over this disease in the seventh grade in school. . . . What's the matter with you, Vadim?" She looked at him with amused incomprehension, and he, frowning with embarrassment, turned silent.[4]

It becomes apparent from these few lines of text that there exists a considerable discrepancy between the values of the young man who has the makings of an idealist and those of a spoiled young miss, the

[4]Yurii Trifonov, "Studenty" (Students), *Novyi Mir*, 10, 1950, pp. 156-158.

daughter of a renowned Moscow engineer who lives in a modern post-war apartment with an electric garbage disposall and drives about in a *Pobeda* with chauffeur. The embarrassing thing is that both young people are in their early twenties and that it is the idealist who is embarrassed and clumsy.

These two young people fail to understand each other and that in terms of basic values. The inarticulateness and insecurity of the young man, who seems to be saying the "correct" things, stands in sharp contrast to the easy, almost flippant nonchalance of the girl. On evidence of a considerable number of post-war novels, it can be stated that what the young man is worried about is not as fashionable as it used to be. The girl's way of reasoning, on the other hand, is common among girls of the new middle class. In her flippant way, although stating later in the debate that between fellow komsomols all ideological discussions are "unoriginal" and silly, she hints at one important problem, that of different life patterns among the young which must, ideology notwithstanding, account for basic misunderstandings even among komsomol members. This young woman's hope for a happy, peaceful married life, accented by some salon songs which she will sing to her husband occasionally, are life expectations more open and candid than those of the young man, which remain somehow vague. These feminine hopes are carried on the crest of the ascending meshchanstvo or middle-classdom. The author, if ever so mildly, happens to disapprove of her aspirations. And in revenge, he attaches to this young woman the traditional designation of an empty-headed little miss. But is she so empty-headed? In Soviet society today a failure to achieve exactly what she dreams of, happy family life, is frowned upon. This passage serves to point out that the pretty, well-dressed, empty-headed little middle-class miss has come back and that her needs and hopes are more akin to the spirit of the new middle class than to the militant dogmas of the komsomol. And yet this charming and perfumed variety of Philistine is a rather proud komsomol member, who wins an easy victory over an idealistic young man whose concern about "a final goal in life, about the supreme good, about *narod*" she dismisses as being ridiculous and obsolete. She refuses to be bothered with the loftier problems of mankind while she is engaged in studying to become a woman. She belongs to the upper middle class, not to say aristocracy, and thus was exposed to the best schooling available. Her mental and emotional makeup might represent a hint that the bourgeois spirit is far-reaching and envelops the lowest and the

highest strata of the middle class. It is an irrefutable fact that this coquettish coed is as much a product of the public school and of the komsomol as the idealistic young veteran.

Descriptions of interiors in post-war literature clearly support the hypothesis of the enormous gains accomplished by meshchanstvo in the Stalinist era. If stiff leather jackets, barren dormitories, bitter black tobacco, and bisexual boots were some of the inevitable attributes of the austerity of bygone days, it became precarious for the Soviet citizen to revert to those attributes. For asceticism is evaluated as a grievous sin. Pink and orange emerge as the favorite colors and it seems that Soviet women of all walks of life cannot possibly survive without a profusion of artificial flowers with which they adorn themselves and their homes.

Perhaps just one interior should be introduced here. It is inhabited by a cheerful and thoroughly positive young couple. In fact, they are the most prominent "cultural workers" in a provincial town. The husband, who is a war veteran and director of a factory club, has brought home from the war

> a heap of American movie magazines. And Tamara decorated her rooms with colored photographs of film actresses with scarlet mouths and film actors with narrow moustaches. . . On an intricate series of little shelves Tamara had arranged a display of baby dolls with large bows, bright cologne bottles, and little sea-shell boxes. And tea was always served under the orange lampshade in red polka-dotted cups. In this small, gay, and bright paradise everybody was pleased with life.[5]

This is the post-war Stalinist version of beautiful life.

One could attribute the following rationalization to the régime. If the acquisition of these objects helps to make the average citizen content, home and family-bound, it is a small price indeed to pay in terms of ideological compromise, even if it includes walls plastered with American movie stars. These paradisical citizens are certainly less trouble than those others, those restless ones, who cannot be anchored to little colorful nests, pink, orange, polka-dotted, and scalloped, those who are still outward bound, collective bound, and carry in themselves vestiges of asceticism.

In a way, for an average citizen *not* to desire all these polka dots, petunias, and orange lampshades has come to be interpreted as defeatism. And in that respect, ascetic defeatism is the worst kind.

[5]Zhanna Gausner, "Vot my i doma" (We are Home Again), *Zvezda*, 11, 1947, p. 60.

The danger of asceticism lies today clearly in that it may not be chosen as a way of life on an individual basis. To wish to live austerely and to make such a decision individually, no matter how idealistic the motivation behind it, has come to be a heresy. This does not mean, of course, that an ascetic way of life may not be *ordained* from above for certain individuals. Barren interiors adorned with nothing more than books and radio are reserved exclusively for a certain middle-of-the-ladder, mobile category of Party worker. These people are permitted to relate themselves to what is known as the "broad horizon." But they may no longer be high-handed about it. Access to the "broad horizon" is carefully parcelled out from above and can never be usurped on the basis of one's own initiative.

And if a "broad horizoned" Party worker were to settle anywhere for any length of time and if he were without reproach in connection with arranging his personal life, it is expected of him to combine his larger vistas with great attention to domestic coziness which today is unmistakably spelled out in terms of meshchanstvo.

Government Controls Over the Press in Russia, 1905-1914

By Jacob Walkin

The study of the press in Russia after 1905 presents a peculiar problem. Judging from the comments to be found in the writings of the Russians themselves at that time, the press had gained nothing from the revolution of 1905 and was subject to the same arbitrary administrative controls which had been prevalent before 1905. A closer examination of what could and could not be said after 1905 reveals, however, that the Russians had acquired a relatively free press, high in quality, and despite the retention of many irritating controls, not substantially different in its freedom of criticism from the Western press. As concerns newspapers and magazines, this was true mainly of those published in Moscow and St. Petersburg, although the provincial press too made many gains and was improving rapidly on the eve of World War I both in quantity and quality. If the Russian press is to be properly evaluated, some light must be thrown on the kinds of controls available to the government after 1905 and the effectiveness of these controls. It is this phase of the problem with which this article is concerned.

The laws governing the press promulgated in 1905 and 1906 abolished preliminary censorship for newspapers and periodicals in all cities of the Empire, and for all books and pamphlets.[1] Abolished also were all the administrative punishments formerly exercised so freely, including the right of the Minister of the Interior to prohibit discussion in the press of any problem of state importance. The press was now subject to regulations defined by law, and abuses could be punished only through judicial proceedings. (Some of the means retained by the administration to get around these principles

[1]The most important new laws were the Ukases of November 24, 1905 and March 18, 1906 affecting the periodical press, and the Ukase of April 24, 1906 affecting books and pamphlets. These and other laws may be found in "Ustav o tsenzure i pechati," as amended after 1906, in Vol. XIV, *Svod zakonov*. There are legal commentaries in V. F. Deriuzhinsky, *Politseiskoe pravo*, 2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 228-233; N. M. Korkunov, *Russkoe gosudarstvennoe pravo*, Vol. I, 7th ed., St. Petersburg, 1909, pp. 498-512; and V. V. Ivanovsky, *Uchebnik administrativnago prava*, Kazan, 1907, pp. 204-207.

will be discussed later on.) To symbolize the new order, censorship committees were renamed committees for the affairs of the press.

Upon being printed, each individual number of a newspaper or periodical had to be sent to the appropriate committee or "inspector." Although administrative punishments could no longer be imposed on the publication, the local organ of censorship could order the number confiscated, if in its opinion it violated the criminal code; criminal prosecution was simultaneously instituted against the guilty party, usually the "responsible" or "sitting" editor, a comical figure in the annals of the Russian press, whose rôle will be the subject of further discussion. The order holding back the periodical was immediately placed before an appropriate court, which could, if it confirmed the order, have the periodical suspended until a verdict had been passed in criminal proceedings. The procedure for confiscating books and pamphlets was roughly the same.[2]

There was begun therefore a new era in the history of the Russian press in which confiscations of books or periodicals, the punishment of the editors, and the suspension, temporary or permanent, of a newspaper or magazine depended on the courts. That the situation had materially improved is beyond question, but it is also beyond question that the government continued to remain an irritating deterrent to full freedom of expression. The right of the "censors" to confiscate an individual issue of a newspaper or magazine on the ground that one or another article violated the law seems to have been more a nuisance than a serious deterrent. The number of such confiscations was on the whole large, and despite the provisions of the law, a considerable number of them appear never to have been adjudicated in court. Nevertheless no one of the more moderate journals apparently was subjected to confiscation often enough to find its operations seriously impeded.[3]

[2]Although pamphlets (formerly fixed at 160 pages or less, now reduced to 80 pages or less) were no longer subject to preliminary censorship, copies had to reach the organs of censorship from one to seven days before being distributed. It is curious to note too that newspapers or periodicals with plates, pictures, or other illustrations had to reach the organs of censorship twenty-four hours before circulation was started, the reason being that political satire via this medium had acquired a prominent rôle after the Revolution of 1905. The preliminary censorship of foreign books continued as before.

[3]A Crimean newspaper frequently cited for the large number of its confiscations suffered 70 of them up to 1912, an average of about ten a year. Victor Obninsky, "Pechat i administratsiia," in *Svoboda pechati pri obnovlennom stroe*, St. Petersburg, 1912, p. 190. The liberal Moscow newspaper, *Russkiya Vedomosti*, apparently

The effectiveness of confiscation as a weapon in any form is thrown into question by the circumstances under which it was effected. Copies of a newspaper were sent to the censorship committees only after they were printed and distribution had been begun. Since it required at least one to one and a half hours for the papers to reach the committees and for the committees to read them and order their confiscation (by telephone), it was possible during this interval for the publishers to send all the printed copies into circulation. In rare cases, it is stated in a government document made public by the Soviet government, ten to twenty per cent of the general circulation of a newspaper was confiscated; usually it was even less.[4]

The prosecution of editors, publishers, and writers was a much more serious matter, although it appears likely that some contemporary descriptions have been overdrawn.[5] The Criminal Code and the Code of Punishments under which prosecution was undertaken were tightened after the revolution of 1905 and large numbers of journalists were hailed before the courts for alleged violations of the law. The administration, and the courts as well, were inclined to interpret the law narrowly, with the result that "hundreds of Russian journalists have served, or are serving, terms of imprisonment in a fortress for articles that could only by a stretch of the imagination be described as seditious."[6]

suffered confiscation relatively rarely, the maximum in one year being five in 1912. The courts withdrew the confiscation of two of these five. A complete list of punishments from the time of its establishment is printed in *Russkiya Vedomosti, sbornik statei (1863-1913)*, Moscow, 1913, pp. 304-308.

[4]"Pamiatnaya zapiska o rabochikh gazetakh v Peterburge," *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, Vol. 10, 1925, p. 288. The memorandum printed was written by the St. Petersburg committee for the affairs of the press in September, 1913. I. F. Koshko, writing concerning his activities as vice-governor of Samara (the law placed vice-governors in charge of the censorship, where there were no "censorship" committees), indicates that confiscation was ineffective in the provinces also for the same reason. *Vospominaniya gubernatora (1905-1914 gg.)*, Petrograd, 1916, p. 50. Confiscations were of course more common for the revolutionary journals than for the less extreme journals. A table given in the memorandum printed in *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, p. 292, shows that of 743 issues of the newspapers published by the Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, and Socialist Revolutionaries under various names, 206 were confiscated, and 149 actually reached the courts, which confirmed 126 of the confiscations.

[5]For contemporary descriptions, see Harold Williams, *Russia of the Russians*, New York, 1918, p. 102 and V. Rosenberg, *Letopis russkoi pechati, 1907-1914 gg.*, Moscow, 1914, pp. 10-14 and *passim*.

[6]Williams, *loc. cit.* The statement of a monarchist writer that "punishments for crimes in matters of the press, in the most serious cases, did not exceed 1 year and 4 months of imprisonment" (S. S. Oldenburg, *Tsarstvovanie Imperatora Nikolaia II*,

The courts remained busy with the "literary cases" until February, 1913, when on the occasion of the three-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the House of Romanov, an act of amnesty granted by the Tsar cleared from them all past offenses. There were of course many acquittals as Rosenberg acknowledged in his pre-revolutionary comments.[7] If his later account of the experience of *Russkiya Vedomosti* is accurate, then it seems possible that his and Williams' emphasis on the severity of the criminal prosecutions has been exaggerated. *Russkiya Vedomosti* was a liberal Moscow newspaper likely to be as outspoken as conditions permitted; yet of all the prosecutions which it faced, all but two either never reached the courts, partly because of the 1913 amnesty, or ended in acquittal. In one case the sentence imposed by the court was one day of imprisonment for the responsible editor and a five-ruble fine; in the other case both the responsible editor and the author of the offending article (V. A. Maklakov) were sentenced to two months of imprisonment, but the case was appealed and the matter was ended by the February Revolution in 1917.[8] The newspaper *Rech*, founded in 1906 and edited by I. V. Gessen and Paul Miliukov, reflected the views of the Cadet Party and was much more radical than *Russkiya Vedomosti*. There is unfortunately no systematic discussion of government repression in the memoirs of Gessen, but it is plain from his comments that in the eleven years during which *Rech* was published, the worst that befell it was on one occasion the imprisonment for eight months of "the responsible editor."[9]

It should be recalled too that the criminal prosecutions were undertaken at a time when the entire revolutionary press had come into the open and had begun to operate without any restraints (following the "days of freedom," October 22 to December 2, 1905). For a time it seemed to the government that bringing the press under control was a hopeless task. At any rate the criminal prosecutions were directed to a considerable extent against the unrestrained revo-

Vol. II, Munich, 1949, p. 8) is inaccurate. See some of the relevant provisions of the Criminal Code (as amended up to 1909), Articles 103, 128, and 129, and of the Code of Punishments (as amended up to 1910), Articles 1034 and 1038, in *Svod zakonov*, Vol. XV. Article 103 of the Criminal Code, for example, which was concerned with insults to the Imperial family, provided for a maximum punishment of eight years of hard labor.

[7]Rosenberg, *Letopis russkoi pechati*, pp. 44, 88.

[8]V. Rosenberg, *Iz istorii russkoi pechati*, Prague, 1924, pp. 160-161.

[9]I. V. Gessen, "V dvukh vekakh," in *Arkhiv russkoi revoliutsii*, Vol. XXII, p. 222.

lutionary press, a fact which contemporary Russian writers conveniently ignored in their complaints.[10] There is probably considerable truth in the contention of a Communist writer that ". . . before the war, the press of the liberal bourgeoisie had in fact acquired almost complete freedom and the persecutions of the censorship fell exclusively on the worker's and in part the petty bourgeois presses. . . ."[11]

In any case, criminal prosecutions likewise became in the end no more than a useless irritant. The main reason was that the editor jailed for violations of the law was not the real editor, but the "responsible" or "sitting" editor. The more outspoken newspapers and magazines customarily hired a special employee, usually a peasant or a worker, to serve as the "responsible" editor and if necessary go to jail, so that the real editors could continue their work without interruption.[12]

Organs of the press found guilty of violating the Criminal Code could be ordered closed by the courts, temporarily or permanently. The closing of newspapers or magazines, while never entirely aban-

[10]For the government view on bringing the press under control in 1905-1906, see the letter of Prime Minister Goremykin to the Tsar, June 4, 1906 printed in *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, Vol. 2, 1922, p. 280 and the miscellaneous government documents printed under the title "Tsarizm v borbe s revoliutsionnoi pechatiiu v 1905 g.," *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, Vol. 105, 1941, pp. 140-155. The documents show and the Communist historians who wrote the introductions rightly emphasize that the main target of criminal prosecutions was the revolutionary press.

[11]B. Gorev in *Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya*, Vol. 60, p. 473. The Bolshevik definition of "petty bourgeois" presumably includes the Menshevik and Socialist Revolutionary Parties. One hundred and twenty-six criminal prosecutions were undertaken against 416 issues of the Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda*, as published under various names up to September, 1913; 130 criminal prosecutions were undertaken against 294 issues of the Menshevik newspaper originally published under the name *Luch*; 46 criminal prosecutions were undertaken against 96 issues of the Socialist Revolutionary newspaper originally published as *Trudovoi Golos*. According to the St. Petersburg committee for the affairs of the press, 85 per cent of the prosecutions against these newspapers were successful. "Pamiatnaya zapiska o rabochikh gazetakh v Peterburge," *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, Vol. 10, pp. 291-292. The sentences imposed on editors of revolutionary journals were unquestionably much more severe than those mentioned in the text as having been imposed on the editors of liberal journals.

[12]Harold Williams mentions one liberal paper which hired as responsible editor "a long-bearded, impecunious peasant at a salary of 5 pounds a month while at liberty, and half as much again while in gaol" (*Russia of the Russians*, p. 104). The St. Petersburg censorship committee called attention to the fact that the responsible editors of *Pravda* were semi-literate workers who had no relationship whatsoever with the real editorial staff (*Krasnyi Arkhiv*, Vol. 10, p. 299).

doned as a punitive measure, nevertheless proved to be only partially effective. The reason is to be found in the circumstances under which they could be opened. Formerly a newspaper or magazine could be started only with the permission of the Minister of the Interior. It was now necessary merely to send certain information to the local governor, and if the responsible editor was in full possession of his rights and had no criminal record, the governor was obligated to issue the necessary license within two weeks.[13] The result was that a journal closed by a court could be immediately reopened under a different name, using the same plant, operated by the same staff, and advocating the same political program. The present Communist paper, *Pravda*, for example, was founded in 1912 and operated almost continuously until it was closed by the military censorship at the opening of the war in 1914. Although theoretically closed eight times, it kept reappearing with the same format and using such names as *Workers' Truth*, *Northern Truth*, *Truth of Labor*, *For Truth*, *Proletarian Truth*, *Labor Truth*, and *The Way of Truth*. It was legally sold on the streets and sent through the mails.[14]

In the end it was not judicial control but a new form of administrative punishment which became the most effective and most feared weapon of the administration against the press. It was imposed on the basis of the emergency statute of August 14, 1881. Under that law, the governor or governor-general of localities in a state of emergency (*usilennaya okhrana*) was empowered to issue obligatory decrees, for the violation of which he could impose fines up to 500 rubles (3,000 rubles in localities in an extraordinary state of emergency (*chrezvychainaya okhrana*), and imprisonment up to

[13]For details, see Deriuzhinsky, *Politseiskoe pravo*, pp. 229-230. The local authorities were not required by the law to inquire into the political views of the responsible editor, and for the most part did not do so. There are two known cases where Social Democrats were refused licenses, but on appeal to the First Department of the Senate, that body ruled that all editors satisfying the formal requirements of the law must be given a license, regardless of such problems as their political reliability (Victor Obninsky, in *Svoboda pechati pri obnovlennom stroe*, pp. 158-159, 209). Needless to say, the administration retained sufficient means at its disposal to prevent all but a small fraction of the revolutionary journals opened from continuing in operation.

[14]The story of *Pravda* has been told by Bertram Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, New York, 1948, pp. 559-566. According to the St. Petersburg censorship committee, it avoided interruption by appearing simultaneously under two different titles, each being published in turn (*Krasnyi Arkhiv*, Vol. 10, p. 299). These tactics were impossible before 1905 because the editors and publishers of a journal ordered closed by the administration were forbidden to carry on with any other journal.

three months. On June 4, 1907, a day after the dissolution of the Second Duma and the promulgation of a new electoral law, a series of obligatory decrees concerning the press, substantially alike, were adopted in all localities in a state of emergency. A new means of arbitrary, administrative control over the press, supposedly abandoned in 1905, was thereby restored.[15] Because of the economic difficulties created by the constant fines, imposed at times without any indication of what rules had been violated or what article had been offensive, the poorer journals resorted to the alternative of paying a fine, a jail sentence for the responsible editor. However, as we have seen, it was customary to employ special "sitting" editors to serve the jail sentences.

Too much should not be made of the restoration of administrative punishment by means of the emergency laws, at least as concerns the newspapers and magazines of the two capitals.[16] They were subject of course to very serious financial hazards, but the savage criticisms of the government which could be found in their pages do not indicate that they were seriously intimidated. After 1905, the Russian press had shaken off the worst forms of administrative punishment and to a considerable extent actually reflected the various currents of public opinion, including the opinion of the Bolsheviks.[17]

[15]V. Rosenberg, *Letopis russkoi pechati*, pp. 38-46 and *Iz istorii russkoi pechati*, pp. 157-159. For a more exhaustive treatment of this subject, see Count Paul Tolstoy, "Obiazatelnyia postanovleniia o pechati v poriadke okhrany," in *Svoboda pechati pri obnovlennom stroe*, pp. 86-121. *Usilennaya okhrana* was in effect in almost half of Russia in 1912. The statute of 1881 made some provision for granting emergency powers to local authorities of regions not in a state of emergency, but the right to issue obligatory decrees was not among them. To get around this difficulty, separate Imperial ukases were promulgated, granting the local authorities of areas not in a state of emergency special powers for issuing obligatory decrees. This was of course a flagrant violation of the statute of 1881. Moreover, in renewing the statute by decree after the establishment of a constitutional régime in 1906, the government was in effect legislating by means of an act of higher administration.

[16]While the legal position of the provincial press had not substantially changed after 1905, the political atmosphere had changed, and much in any case depended on the personal views of the local officials. As one provincial paper pointed out, "The state of emergency and the fines gave the administration the possibility of influencing the newspapers in the personal interest of its friends or of influential persons. Repression is not being applied in the field of political and social problems, and is being used only for the purpose of hiding purely personal interests." Quoted by Obninsky, in *Svoboda pechati pri obnovlennom stroe*, p. 220.

[17]For further details on the status of the press before and after 1905, see the writer's forthcoming book, *State and Society in Tsarist and Communist Russia.*

The French Tutor in Radishchev and Pushkin

By Roderick Page Thaler

In Radishchev's *Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow*, in the chapter "Gorodnya," there is an account of the sale of peasants as recruits for the Army. Various recruits are described: one is the sole support of his family, who will be ruined without him; another is glad to go, because even the Army will seem like freedom after the merciless treatment he has had from his owners. Then comes what might be called a comic interlude:

> "As I approached the post station, I found another gathering of peasants, who surrounded a man in a torn coat. He seemed to be somewhat drunk. He was playing the fool before the people, who laughed till the tears came, watching him. 'What is it all about?' I asked a boy. 'What are you laughing at?' 'Well, the recruit is a foreigner and can't speak a word of Russian.' From the few words he spoke, I gathered that he was a Frenchman. That made me still more curious; I wanted to find out how a foreigner could be offered as a recruit by the peasants. I asked him in his native tongue, 'My friend, by what fate did you get here?' . . .
>
> "Frenchman. 'This way. As a child I was apprenticed to a hairdresser in Paris. I left for Russia with a gentleman whose hair I dressed in Petersburg for a whole year. He had no money to pay me; so I left him and almost starved to death, looking for a job. Luckily I got a berth as a sailor, on a ship flying the Russian flag. Before putting to sea, I had to take an oath as a Russian subject; then we set off for Lübeck. On the way the skipper often beat me with a knotted rope for being lazy. Through my carelessness I fell from the rigging to the deck and broke three fingers, which ruined me for ever dressing hair again. When we got to Lübeck I fell in with Prussian recruiting officers and served in various regiments. I was often beaten with sticks for being lazy or drunk. When I was stationed in the garrison at Memel, I got drunk one day and stabbed a fellow; so I had to get out of there in a hurry. Remembering that I had taken my oath in Russia and was a faithful son of the fatherland, I started out for Riga with two thalers in my pocket. On the way I lived on charity. In Riga my good luck and skill served me in good stead. I won some twenty rubles in a tavern and bought myself a good overcoat for ten, and went off with a merchant from Kazan' as his lackey.
>
> " 'As we were going along a street in Moscow, I met two of my countrymen, who advised me to leave my master and look for a teaching job in Moscow. I told them I could hardly read, but they said, "You talk French—that's enough." My master did not see me leaving him on the street, and kept on his way, while I stayed in Moscow. My countrymen soon found me a teaching

job paying 150 rubles a year, plus a pood of sugar, a pood of coffee, ten pounds of tea, my board, a servant, and carriage. But I had to live in the country. So much the better. There they didn't find out for a whole year that I couldn't write. But some one of my master's relatives, who was living at the same place, gave my secret away to him, and they took me back to Moscow. I couldn't find another such fool, and I couldn't dress hair with my broken fingers; so I sold myself for two hundred rubles. They registered me as a peasant, and now I am offered up as a recruit. . . .' "[1]

The French hairdresser couldn't find another such fool, but Pushkin found one: Andrey Petrovich Grinyov. Appropriately enough, Pushkin found him in the days of Radishchev, shortly before the Pugachev Rebellion.

"At that time," says Grinyov's son, who tells the story, "my father hired for me a Frenchman, Monsieur Beaupré, who was fetched from Moscow together with a year's supply of wine and olive oil. . . .

"In his native land Beaupré had been a hairdresser; afterward he was a soldier in Prussia, and then came to Russia *pour être outchitel*,[2] without clearly understanding the meaning of that word. He was a good fellow, but extremely thoughtless and flighty. . . . Besides, 'he was not an enemy of the bottle,' as he put it; that is, he liked to take a drop too much. . . . We made friends at once, and although he was supposed by the agreement to teach me 'French, German, and all subjects,' he preferred to pick up some Russian from me and, after that, we each followed our own pursuits. We got on together capitally. I wished for no other mentor. But fate soon parted us. . . ."

For Grinyov Senior finally discovered what a free and easy teacher Beaupré was.[3] Both Frenchmen, both hairdressers, both ex-Prussian soldiers, both friends of the bottle, both confessedly lazy, and neither knowing quite what an *outchitel* was, these two teachers are unmistakably alike. It would seem that Pushkin meant them to be so, and that possibly he was playing a little joke on the censorship. Perhaps he hoped that a character from a forbidden book might be recognized by some of his readers? It is certain, at all events, that in at least one case he actually named a character from a well-known play that could not be produced or published at the time. He said

[1] A. N. Radishchev, *Puteshestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu*, St. Petersburg, 1790, pp. 389-393. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. I. K. Luppol *et al.* for the Academy of Sciences of the U. S. S. R., Moscow and Leningrad, 1938, I, 369-371. I have used a MS. translation of Radishchev's *Journey* by Professor Leo Wiener.

[2] To be a teacher. Printed in Roman letters in the Russian text.

[3] A. S. Pushkin, "Kapitanskaya dochka," ch. 1, in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, Moscow and Leningrad, 1936, IV, 239-240. I have used Natalie Duddington's translation in *The Poems, Prose and Plays of Alexander Pushkin*, ed. Avrahm Yarmolinsky, New York, The Modern Library, 1936, pp. 600-601.

that Evgeny Onegin, returning from his travels abroad, went from the ship straight to a ball, "like Chatsky," the hero of Griboedov's *Woe from Wit*.[4] Not wishing to suffer woe from his own wit, Pushkin was reasonably circumspect in his handling of the Beaupré episode. Perhaps the neatest touch in the whole affair is the name—Monsieur Beaupré (Mr. Bowsprit)—Pushkin invented for Radishchev's French-Prussian-Russian sailor.

[4]Pushkin, *Evgenii Onegin*, chapter VIII, stanza xiii, line 14, in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 1936, III, 145.

Book Reviews

CARR, EDWARD HALLETT. *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923*, Vol. 3. New York, Macmillan, 1953. 614 pp. $6.00.

The present volume completes E. H. Carr's history of the Bolshevik Revolution, the publication of which began in 1951. The third volume deals with the history of Soviet foreign policy during its early, formative stages, both in Europe and Asia taking into account the usual channels of diplomatic activity, as well as the more unorthodox instruments of power politics, such as the Comintern.

In this field of inquiry Mr. Carr is more at home than he had been in his investigations of constitutional or economic problems, with which he dealt in the preceding two volumes. This perhaps accounts in part for the greater historical perspective with which he treats Soviet Russia's activities abroad, as compared with his analysis of domestic political actions. He realizes too well the complexities of international politics to have recourse to the generalizations and over-simplifications which had marred the first part of his history. But then perhaps it is also possible that further investigation revealed to Mr. Carr certain sources of Soviet behavior of which he was not fully aware when he had issued the first installment, and one may well wonder how the first volume would have read had Mr. Carr waited with its publication till now.

In the first volume Mr. Carr assumed that the excesses committed by the Bolsheviks were essentially due to the unreasonableness and disloyalty of their opponents. In making this assumption, he tended to forget that indeed these excesses were inherent in Lenin's political thought, and that within the framework of the Soviet system no recourse was left to the opposition but conspiracy, rebellion, and foreign intrigue. This fundamental misconception which underlay the narrative contained in the first volume, and was at the time of its publication severely condemned by many critics, is far less in evidence in the present volume, though even here it is not entirely absent. Mr. Carr makes no mistake about the basic assumption of Bolshevik world politics. He quotes Lenin to the effect that the coexistence of the Soviet and "imperialist" states is inconceivable, and throughout his narrative stresses the revolutionary, expansionist character of Soviet Russia. And yet, occasionally, he still refuses to draw full consequences from this fact, as when, for instance, he blames the Western powers for instituting in 1919 a commercial boycott of Soviet Russia "merely because of objections to its form of government." (p. 149). It should be quite clear from the facts he cites that it was not the form of Soviet Russia's government but its international aims which determined Western behavior towards the Bolsheviks then, as they do now.

The present volume is probably the most complete history of early Soviet foreign relations, and one based upon the widest selection of sources. The evidence is carefully examined, and due weight given to the interests and prejudices of its authors. It is difficult to overesti-

mate the accomplishment of the author in sifting through the voluminous literature and in presenting it in a coherent, lucid manner.

Now that the first installment of this History of Soviet Russia is completed, a few remarks about the whole work may be in order. From the point of view of scope and thoroughness of research Mr. Carr's study is of monumental proportions; it is the first history of early Soviet Russia based upon an exhaustive analysis of the large body of literature in Russian and Western European languages bearing upon the political and economic developments of the Soviet state. No other existing study can stand comparison with it either in wealth of source material or in the scope of investigation. But it falls considerably short of being truly great history, for it lacks an over-all vision, an interpretation capable of connecting the inexhaustible multitude of facts into something meaningful and relating it to both the past and the future. Essentially Mr. Carr's work is an agglomeration of fragments, each sound and coherent in itself, but only most superficially related to the other aspects of contemporary life. Who were the Bolsheviks, what did they want, why did some follow them and others resist? What was the intellectual and moral atmosphere in which all these events occurred, and what significance do they have for the following generations? Questions of this sort the author does not endeavor to answer, either because he considers them outside the scope of his study, or—as appears more likely in view of his changing attitude toward his topic—because he has not arrived at the answers in his own mind. The fragmentariness of the whole history emerges nowhere more clearly than in the method used to tell the story: the chapters are divided not chronologically, but topically, and thus the events are artificially isolated from one another. It is characteristic, too, that the whole work lacks a conclusion. Having finished the three-volume history, the reader may be better informed about each individual event which had occurred in or around Russia between 1917 and 1923, but he does not acquire a much deeper understanding of the whole phenomenon of the Russian Revolution. One may hope that as he proceeds with his researches into the history of Soviet Russia, Mr. Carr shall offer a more unified and profound interpretation of the material which he has so fully mastered.

RICHARD E. PIPES
Russian Research Center
Harvard University

FAINSOD, MERLE. *How Russia is Ruled.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1953. 575 pp. $7.50.

Professor Fainsod has produced the most distinguished volume yet to appear in the "Russian Research Center Studies." *How Russia is Ruled* is a major contribution. Some will value it most for its scholarly tone and approach; some, for its skilled use of a wide range of materials; and some will like it because it is a readable, soundly-based synthesis. It will be found useful for reading, for study, and for reference; and it deserves a place in the working library of every student of the Soviet system.

How Russia is Ruled is divided into four parts. Part I, mainly historical, consists of an excellent sur-

vey of the circumstances under which and of the ways and means by which Lenin's Bolsheviks rose to power. It analyzes, also, some of the major changes which this rise forced upon the Party. This is not the only historical material in the book. Professor Fainsod does not belong to that group which, having made a perfunctory bow to the problems of origins and development, then forgets all about the past. Part II ("The Role of the Party"), for example, briefly but ably deals with things as they were, as well as with things as they are. Chapter 6 ("The Growth of the Party Apparatus"), to be more specific, gives an excellent account of Stalin's rise to power. This same familiarity with and appreciation of history are also apparent in Parts III ("Instruments of Rule") and IV ("Controls and Tensions"), although because of the nature of its subject history is least prominent in the last.

Professor Fainsod does not ignore the formal tables of organization or the charts and diagrams which illustrate them, but, as he puts it in his Preface, he is as much concerned with the physiology as with the anatomy of Soviet totalitarianism. ". . . To communicate a sense of the living political processes in which Soviet rulers and subjects are enmeshed" is one of the book's major aims. To achieve this aim, Professor Fainsod made considerable use of material obtained through interviews with Soviet escapees and defectors. Such material is tricky stuff to handle, requiring the highest professional and scholarly skills along with a generous measure of common sense. Lacking access to this particular source, it is impossible to judge Fainsod's use of it. But the internal evidence of his book indicates that he used the material with both insight and caution.

Insight of the kind which grows only from long and thoughtful study characterizes much of *How Russia is Ruled.* A large-scale illustration of this is the chapter dealing with Soviet youth, especially with the Komsomol. Rejecting as totally untenable both the official Party claim that ". . . the younger generation is fanatically and passionately devoted to Communism," and the extreme counter-claim that ". . . the whole body of Soviet youth is ready to rise up in revolt against the régime at the first opportunity," Professor Fainsod suggests that there is a hard core of Komsomol fanaticism even though many Komsomols remain politically passive or even hostile. In his judgment, the Party's intense activities among Soviet youth have, in spite of failures here and there, played ". . . a rôle of crucial significance in replenishing the life energies of the régime."

Another example of Fainsod's insight is his treatment of the place of doctrine. This subject appears in several connections, naturally. Fainsod's general interpretation may perhaps be fairly summarized by the following comment which appears in his discussion of "The Party Command" (Chapter 10). "Not even the most pragmatically-oriented member of the ruling group can wholly liberate himself from the frame of responses that represent the residue of a lifetime immersion in Communist thought patterns." If this simple truth were more generally recognized, we might be spared much misplaced enthusiasm for and faulty interpretation of the testimonies of some ex-Communists.

The final part of the book may perhaps be fairly regarded as its most original contribution (as distinct from a synthesis of more familiar materials). In the three final chapters, Professor Fainsod examines "controls and tensions" within Soviet society and sums up his general conclusions. His examination of controls and tensions is focussed upon "the Soviet factory" and agriculture. Controls in the factory are dealt with in terms of management, organization, Party, police, and trade unions. Professor Fainsod concludes that, "The calculated mixture of incentives, indoctrination, and repression which the régime has installed in the factory appears adequate to hold discontent in check and to maintain the drive for increased output." He reaches essentially the same conclusion in regard to agriculture: "As long as the régime retains its firm grip on the system of agricultural controls, it is difficult to see how peasant disaffection can find an organized focus."

These conclusions lead to the opinion that ". . . sanguine hopes that Soviet domestic and international policy will undergo fundamental revision do not appear to be warranted." And the final line of the book sums up Professor Fainsod's general conclusion: "The totalitarian régime does not shed its police-state characteristics; it dies when power is wrenched from its hands." Not all specialists will agree with these judgments, which run counter to those once cogently argued by Mr. George Kennan, and are at odds, also, with the general thesis of Dr. Barrington Moore's most recent book, *Terror and Progress—USSR.* My own view happens to coincide generally with that of Professor Fainsod, a coincidence of no importance. What is important is that we keep intact our freedom to disagree on such matters because only with such freedom can scholars and others continue to grow both in knowledge and in understanding.

WARREN B. WALSH
The Maxwell School
Syracuse University

FISCHER, GEORGE. *Soviet Opposition to Stalin: A Case Study in World War II.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1952. 230 pp. $4.00.

The author of this study—his first—is the son of the well known journalist, Louis Fischer. Intelligently conceived, carefully written, balanced in judgment, and discerning in its analysis, this book establishes Fischer *fils* as an authority on Soviet affairs in his own right.

The book contains two component parts. The first is given over to a description and analysis of the Vlasov movement of World War II, which, though vaguely known and understood at the time in the West, is the outstanding single instance of mass opposition to the régime of Stalin since the early 1920's. The second, and shorter, part takes issue with the prevailing American interpretations of the possibility and character of native opposition to the Soviet régime. For his material Mr. Fischer interviewed some thirty key figures involved in or with the Vlasov movement and drew upon the material published for the Nuremburg Trials, as well as Vlasovite publications and German war documents. Though the material available was not sufficient to answer all the questions related to the

movement, still Mr. Fischer has written the first adequate and scholarly treatment of the Vlasov movement and has dispersed much of the fog that hitherto surrounded our understanding of it.

Formed from the large number of Soviet citizens on German territory during World War II, under the leadership of ex-Red Army Lieutenant General Andrei A. Vlasov, the movement developed a considerable organizational and propaganda cadre, brought together some 50,000 Soviet citizens in a last-minute military campaign against the Red Army, and but for German interference might have drawn as many as a million armed Soviet citizens into its ranks. It was, however, a movement destined to frustration, futility, and failure born of the Soviet context out of which its adherents came, of Nazi distrust and racial arrogance, and of Western failure to understand the causes and nature of the movement.

Mr. Fischer devotes the first five chapters of his book to what he calls "the phantom stage" of the movement, from the summer of 1942 to the summer of 1944. He takes up in order the Soviet defeat of 1941 which opened the way to an opposition movement in the first place; the German context which enabled such a movement to develop on German territory; biographies of Vlasov and his chief associates and the apparent reasons for their defection; the Russian Army of Liberation (ROA) which as such never existed; and the Russian National Committee, the head of a non-existent liberation movement. The next four chapters relate the Himmler stage of the movement in which, during the last few months of the War, the movement acquired tangible features by virtue of Himmler's support. The author explains the reason for Himmler's support; the establishment of the Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia (KONR), which was enabled to organize a military force (quite distinct from the non-existent ROA), consisting of two divisions, one of which actually fought the Red Army; and the tragic end of Vlasov, his associates, and the movement itself.

In the last four chapters, using the Vlasov movement as the major case study available, Mr. Fischer presents an analysis of the likelihood, forms, and aspirations of opposition in the Soviet Union and of the meaning of this opposition for the United States. He finds the likelihood of effective Soviet opposition to Stalin to be little, mainly because of political inertness, i.e., the suppression of individual initiative in anything remotely related to politics. Though a kind of amorphous opposition is widespread in the USSR, it expresses itself mainly in passive disaffection and, since World War II, in individual defection. Only after Soviet reverses in general war and through collaboration with an anti-Soviet power, as in the case of the Vlasov movement, does organized opposition to the Soviet régime appear likely. Meanwhile, the ideology of such organized opposition as might develop will no doubt combine libertarian aspirations with authoritarian means to achieve the welfare state. Mr. Fischer concludes by warning Americans against assuming that the Soviet opposition is wholly opposed to the Soviet régime and on the side of the anti-Soviet bloc, and against overestimating the explosiveness of Soviet nationalities in time of peace or underestimating it in time of war.

The population of the USSR manifests a profound Soviet nationalism and supports much of the Soviet socio-economic order. Thus it was exceptionally unreceptive to Nazi Germany's New Order and is equally so to the American Way of Life. At the same time, contrary to widespread American faith in the extent of Soviet opposition, Mr. Fischer emphasizes its weaknesses again and again.

Because this study disagrees with some optimistic American notions about the nature and possibilities of Soviet opposition (cf. Eugene Lyons' recent *Our Secret Allies, the Peoples of Russia*), it no doubt will not be universally praised. To me, however, Mr. Fischer's argument appears both well founded and well supported. It is free of wishful thinking, rests on prolonged reflection of the evidence, and avoids monistic explanations of so complex a phenomenon as the peoples of the Soviet Union. It is a book which should be read, if it has not already been read, by those responsible for our cold war against the Soviet Union.

Aside from an occasional infelicitous phrasing of a sentence, I have only one adverse comment to make. In titling the book *Soviet Opposition to Stalin* Mr. Fischer seems to intend a distinction between Stalin and the Soviet régime (e.g., pp. 137, 149, 163), yet he never makes clear any such intention, or distinction. If the opposition was to Stalin as a person, his death obviously changes the situation radically. If the opposition was to the terroristic and non-libertarian features of the Soviet régime, which is what I assume Mr. Fischer means, his conclusions continue to be valid. In which case the declared intentions of the present Soviet leadership, if carried through, promise to reduce rather than increase Soviet opposition.

RAYMOND H. FISHER
University of California
Los Angeles

NOLDE, BORIS. *La formation de l'Empire Russe. Etudes, notes et documents.* Vol. I Paris, 1952. 296 pp. 1200 fr. Vol. II Paris, 1953. 405 pp. 1500 fr.

In the preface to his last work, published posthumously, Baron Boris Nolde points out that the process whereby Muscovy, a second-rate power in the northern confines of Europe, transformed itself within less than 400 years into an empire comprising 197 nationalities and nearly 200 million people has never been studied as a whole. Historians have so far either paid little heed to the problems of growth and organization of the Russian imperial organism, or have concentrated on its purely local aspects; the Russian government itself seems never to have comprehended the unique nature of the Empire. The field was thus left free for facile generalizations based on fragmentary evidence and for historically unsound "theses" of every description. It is to remedy this state of affairs that Nolde set out to write a history of "Greater Russia," coining a term analogous to Seeley's.

The author died with his task but half-fulfilled; but even so, Nolde's two volumes account for a vast area comprising the Khanate of Kazan, the Ural and western Siberia, south Russia, with special emphasis on the Khanate of Crimea, parts of the Caucasus (Kabarda and Daghestan) and Georgia. The period covered

extends from the foundation of Sviazhsk in 1551, which Nolde regards as the birth of the Russian Empire, to 1801; only in the chapter on Bessarabia does the author penetrate far into the nineteenth century.

Nolde begins the discussion of each area by analyzing, to the extent that his sources permit, its political and social structure prior to its inclusion into Russia; he describes the mechanics of its incorporation, never forgetting the broader social and diplomatic picture, the latter being especially important for the southern acquisitions of Catherine II. Only then does he proceed to examine in detail the administrative, social, and sometimes cultural consequences of the incorporation for the area and to trace their subsequent modifications. The author presents all this wealth of complex information with the utmost economy of words in a lucid narrative, whose chief adornment is in the clarity of thought it expresses. Eight maps accompany the text and are most helpful to the reader; the absence of an index is regrettable, and is only partially offset by a detailed table of contents.

A vast amount of meticulous research underlies every part of Nolde's work. There is very little in the printed primary materials that the author has not examined carefully (one might cite as an example of one of his few omissions A. Chuloshnikov's *Materialy po istorii Bashkirskoi ASSR*, Moscow 1936); in addition he has perused many rare and obscure publications by nineteenth-century scholars, and for this reason his bibliography is in itself a valuable aid for students of Russian history. Nolde evinces a marked disinclination to accept on faith the statements of previous authorities, no matter how reputable; he uses secondary works chiefly as a means to penetrate to the sources on which they are based. This asceticism of the method gives the whole work a flavor of freshness usually associated with archival research. The trenchant analysis of his materials leads the author to many novel and original conclusions and interpretations scattered throughout the text and the copious footnotes. Nolde's original contributions are especially apparent in his treatment of the following subjects: the nature of the *iasak* in the Kazan territory in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (I, 71-76); private *vs.* state industrial enterprise in central Ural in the eighteenth century (I, 245-259); the "New Serbia" and the Zaporozhian Cossacks (II, 30-59, 229-242); relations between Catherine II and Frederick II, or between the Crimean Khans and their Nogai vassals (II, *passim*); the Reichenbach Agreement of 1790 (II, 201-208); the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War of 1806-1812 (II, 259 ff.); and the movements of many tribes and colonists.

The general picture of the formation of the Russian Empire which emerges from Nolde's work is extremely complex. No simple formula will explain its growth, for variety was the keynote in the motives and methods of Russian expansion and organization of new lands. Thus, for example, the multinational Tartar Tsardom of Kazan was secured by a quick military conquest, as a result of which Moscow stepped into the shoes of the former sovereign power in the area, and sought to preserve as much as possible the old social, administrative, fiscal, and judicial order in the newly-won territory. But most of

the Tartar higher aristocracy had disappeared in battle or through emigration, and there was an influx of Russian military, ecclesiastical, and agricultural colonists who were settled on lands escheated to the crown and in the cities. Other areas had quite a different fate: for instance, tribal aristocracy was the chief instrument of Russian dominion over the Nogais in the southern steppes; a local "quisling" chieftain helped to subjugate the Ostiaks of Konda; Ufa, a Russian fort established to protect one of the roads to Siberia, came to dominate the surrounding Bashkir countryside; central Ural was acquired mainly through peaceful colonization by the Russians; a number of "buffer states" of various degrees of autonomy kept appearing and disappearing in south Russia; the Georgians themselves implored Russian protection and closer ties with the Empire in order to withstand their warlike neighbors.

As a rule the Russian government installed its military commanders and garrisons in forts to ensure peace in the area; it taxed the native population according to locally prevalent usage, sometimes commuting the taxes for certain specified services; frequently it tried to equate the status and services of the native upper classes with those of the Russian military service gentry. But in general it tended to preserve the native institutions and customs, and while in many places it helped the Russian colonizers, it also sought to protect the indigenous populations from encroachments by the Russian settlers. Even Peter the Great, with his belief in a unitary state, and Catherine II, with her predilection for legal and administrative uniformity, deviated only occasionally from this tradition.

Without indulging in polemics, Nolde's book demolishes the view that Russian expansion proceeded according to a preconceived masterplan; and, of course, the geopoliticians' "heartland" and "search for warm-water ports" theories fall to the ground. It is also apparent that the view that the Russian Empire was formed largely by elemental self-propelled streams of individual colonists, the Russian government being a rather impotent bystander, is equally erroneous: the helping and organizing hand of the central government is evident at every turn. This aspect of Nolde's work makes one keenly aware of the absence in historical literature of any comprehensive study of the nature and evolution of the concept of empire (as distinct from the theory of government) in the Russian governing circles.

In exploring the history of the Russian Empire, one might take issue with Nolde's dating its birth in 1551: certainly the creation of the vassal "tsardom of Kasimov" in 1452-53 qualifies Basil II rather than Ivan IV to be regarded as the founder of the Muscovite Empire. Moreover, imperial problems, not unlike those of Muscovy, had been faced by Kievan Russia, with its tributary Finnish and Lithuanian tribes and buffer groups of "*svoi poganye*" Turkish clansmen. Even more important for future developments was the empire of the Republic of Novgorod, which Moscow absorbed in the fifteenth century: it had developed its own tradition of imperial administration, and in organizing the Perm March it had created a base for further eastward expansion. Thus the Empire of Moscow, to which St. Petersburg fell heir, was in reality the third

Russian Empire inheriting the experience of the other two.

ANDREW LOSSKY
University of California
Los Angeles

RIAZANOVSKY, NICHOLAS V. *Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1953. 244 pp. $6.00.

The term Slavophilism has been used in a great many ways—not only to characterize nineteenth-century theories of Russia's superiority to the West, but also to label various nationalist ideologies and Pan-Slav doctrines.

The author concerns himself with Slavophilism in its narrower meaning. He presents the ideas and beliefs of the six leading Russian intellectuals who founded the movement and influenced a score of epigones. He begins by showing the common background of these men—all offspring of gentry families, all leading the sheltered, leisurely and cultured life of country squires, well acquainted with Moscow, her University, and her intellectual life, and well versed in the ideas of German romanticist philosophers, especially Shelling and Hegel.

Mr. Riazanovsky then continues with a series of brief biographical sketches of the six men—Aleksei Khomiakov, leader of the movement; Ivan Kireevsky, philosopher of Slavophilism; Petr Kireevsky, student of Russian folklore; Konstantin Aksakov, historian of the doctrine; Ivan Aksakov, journalist, publicist and popularizer of Slavophilism; and Iurii Samarin, public figure active in the execution of the Emancipation Act.

The second and main part of the book is devoted to presenting the Slavophile doctrine as a whole. This is done under three headings: "We and They," "The Slavophile Ideology," and "The Slavophile Argument"—a division which, in the opinion of this reviewer, is confusing and leads to unnecessary repetitions. Under "We and They" the psychological, philosophical, and political contrasts and antagonisms between Russia and the West as seen by the Slavophiles are discussed. The chapter on Slavophile Ideology deals with, or rather continues to deal with, Slavophile criticism of the materialistic and rationalistic Western civilization as a whole and of the leading European countries in particular. This criticism is followed by an account of Slavophile views on the truly Christian virtues of the Russian people, the spiritual freedom cultivated by the Orthodox church and the beneficial functions of the peasant commune. The "Slavophile Argument" stresses the religious nature of man and contrasts it to the rationalistic approach to human problems in the West.

While discussing these thoughts of the Slavophiles, the author repeatedly stresses the fanatical faith of these men in their ideals, a faith which led them to preach rather than talk, to demand rather than suggest, to expose rather than criticize. This deeply emotional nature of Slavophilism could be more easily understood by Western readers had the author introduced his investigation with a brief analysis of the Russian intelligentsia as a whole, of which the Slavophiles formed a part. Such an analysis would have shown that the Russian mind was steeped for centuries in religious contemplation and de-

prived of rudimentary rational training. When the Russians began to be interested in intellectual matters and a native intelligentsia emerged, the thinking of this group retained the historical element of Faith and more often than not displayed total devotion to an idea, not admitting of any doubts, reservations, qualifications, or revisions. The emotional aspects of Slavophilism were due to the fact that scepticism, caution, objectivity, and dispassionate analysis have never been the strong points of Russian thought.

VALENTINE TSCHEBOTARIOFF BILL
Princeton University

BROWN, EDWARD. *The Proletarian Episode in Russian Literature, 1928-1932.* New York, Columbia University Press, 1953. 311 pp. $4.50.

This study, one of the first volumes in a new series launched by the Russian Institute at Columbia University, is essential reading for all those interested in Soviet literature, and particularly those interested in the process by which the Communist Party brought literature under its control. It will require a revision of the generally-accepted judgment of the rôle of the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP) and of Leopold Averbakh in Soviet literature and literary theory during the First Five-Year Plan.

Despite the title, Mr. Brown devotes a quarter of his book to the development of "proletarian" literary organizations before 1928 and to the theories of their opponents, principally Alexander Voronsky. His attention to the immediate background is well justified, however, since the 1928-1932 period would hardly be comprehensible without an understanding of preceding controversies. Although the author pays scant attention to a number of literary groups of the period, he traces very clearly the complex and often confused pattern of relationships among the numerous proletarian groups—the Proletcult, the "Smithy" group, the "Octobrists," the "On Guardists," VAPP and RAPP.

The major contribution of this work, however, is in its analysis of the activity of the RAPP leadership between 1928 and 1932. It has become the custom to ascribe to RAPP, and particularly to Averbakh, its most prominent leader, most of the responsibility for the deadening regimentation of literature during this period. Averbakh is often pictured as an exponent of the "social demand" and a diligent and willing instrument of the Party in harnessing literature to its industrialization and collectivization drives.

Mr. Brown shows convincingly, however, that the RAPP leadership maintained a theory of literature considerably at variance with the more extreme Party demands of the period and that it acceded reluctantly and half-heartedly to those demands only after repeated pressure from a minority within RAPP and from high Party sources. Averbakh, Fadeyev and Libedinsky placed great emphasis upon the ideological content of literary work, but they also insisted that literary values not be forgotten. They resisted the point of view that RAPP—or the Party—should dictate precise themes for Soviet writers, or that all books be on contemporary subjects, or that writers should idealize or whitewash ("varnish" was their word) reality.

The author cites copious material from two RAPP literary journals, *October* and *On Literary Guard* to support his thesis. He points out that the *Literary Gazette*, often quoted by investigators as representing the RAPP leadership, was in fact in the hands of the RAPP minority (Bezyminsky, Gorbachev, Rodov, etc.), thus cannot be used to illustrate the official attitude of the organization. Some of the most interesting works of the period were published in *October*—Libedinsky's *Birth of a Hero* and the opening parts of Sholokhov's *Silent Don* are two examples—and these by no means coincided with the literary Party line of the day. Theoretical and critical articles in *On Literary Guard* also often diverged from the official policies.

RAPP's downfall, Mr. Brown argues, was a direct result of the conflict between Party policies and those of Averbakh and his associates. Averbakh modified some of his theories, especially after 1930, but he remained uncompromising enough to write a thinly-veiled criticism of Party policy even after the dissolution of RAPP by the Central Committee in April, 1932.

It should be noted that this book is devoted almost entirely to literary movements and conflicting literary theories, and very little attention is given to the actual literature produced during the period. But we can be thankful to the author for his clear and penetrating analysis of an extremely confused and difficult subject.

Jack F. Matlock, Jr.
Dartmouth College

Bibliography

Books, Pamphlets, and Articles on Russia Published in 1953*

I BOOKS and PAMPHLETS[1]

Allen, W. E. D. and Muratov, Paul. *Caucasian Battlefields; a History of the Wars on the Turco-Caucasian Border, 1828-1921.* New York, Cambridge University Press. 614pp. $14.00.

American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism. *The World's Dilemma and a Way Out: Liberation of the Peoples of the Soviet Union; a Declaration.* New York, The Committee. 24pp.

Andreev, Aleksandr I., ed. *Russian Discoveries in the Pacific and in North America in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries; a Collection of Materials;* tr. from the Russian by Carl Ginsburg. Ann Arbor, Mich., Edwards Brothers, 1952. 214pp. $4.00.

Anisimov, Oleg. *The Ultimate Weapon;* with a Preface by William J. Donovan. Chicago, Henry Regnery. 163pp. $3.50.

Avtorkhanov, A. (Uralov, Alexander, pseud.) *The Reign of Stalin;* tr. from the French by L. J. Smith. London, The Bodley Head. 256pp. 18/.

Bakunin, Mikhail. *Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism;* comp. and ed. by G. P. Maximoff. Glencoe, Ill., Free Press. 434pp. $6.00.

Baldwin, Roger N., ed. *A New Slavery; Forced Labor: The Communist Betrayal of Human Rights.* Introd. by A. A. Berle, Jr. New York, Oceana Publications. 158pp. $2.50.

Battle, Laurie C. *Progress in Control of Strategic Exports to Soviet Bloc,* [Submitted to the House of Representatives] Committee on Foreign Affairs. Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 50pp.

Beloff, Max. *Soviet Policy in the Far East, 1944-1951.* New York, Oxford. 278pp. $4.00.

Bergson, Abram, ed. *Soviet Economic Growth; Conditions and Perspective.* Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson. 376pp. $6.00.

—. *Soviet National Income and Product in 1937.* New York, Columbia University. 156pp. $3.75.

Berman, Harold J. *Russians in Focus.* Boston, Little, Brown. 209pp. $3.00.

Björk, Lief. *Wages, Prices and Social Legislation in the Soviet Union;* tr. from the Swedish by M. A. Michael. London, Dobson. 199pp. 18/.

Blattberg, Wolf. *The Story of the Hebrew and Yiddish Writers in the Soviet Union.* New York, In-

---

*Compiled by Virginia L. Close, Reference Department, Baker Library, Dartmouth College.

[1]Due to limitations of space, reprints and revised editions have generally been excluded.

stitute of Jewish Affairs. 24pp. $.50.

Borkenau, Franz. *European Communism.* New York, Harper. 564 pp. $6.00.

Bouscaren, A. T. *Imperial Communism.* Washington, Public Affairs Press. 256pp. $3.75.

British Workers' Delegation to the U.S.S.R., November 1952. *What We Saw in Russia: The Report,* by George Elvin and Others. London, The Delegation. 28pp. 6d.

Browder, Robert P. *The Origins of Soviet-American Diplomacy.* Princeton, N. J., Princeton University. 256pp. $5.00.

Brown, Edward J. *The Proletarian Episode in Russian Literature, 1928-1932.* New York, Columbia University. 311pp. $4.50.

Caroe, Olaf [Kirkpatrick]. *Soviet Empire: The Turks of Central Asia and Stalinism.* London, Macmillan. 300pp. 25/.

Carr, Edward H. *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923.* Vol. 3. New York, Macmillan. 614pp. $6.00.

Chamberlin, William H. *Beyond Containment.* Chicago, Henry Regnery. 406pp. $5.00.

Clews, John. *The Communists' New Weapon—Germ Warfare.* Foreword by Prof. A. V. Hill. London, Lincolns Prager. 32pp. 1/6.

Colton, Ethan T. and Others. *The Russia We Face Now.* Washington, Public Affairs Institute. 79pp. $1.75 (cloth) or $1.25 (paper).

Commentary (Magazine) *The New Red Anti-Semitism; a Symposium,* ed. by Elliot E. Cohen. Boston, Beacon Press. 58pp. $1.50 (hardbound) or $.75 (paper).

Coulson, Jessie, and Duddington, Natalie, eds. *Russian Short Stories: XIXth Century.* Oxford, Clarendon Press. 240pp. 15/.

Critical Bibliography of Communist Purges and Trials in the Soviet Union and in the "People's Democracies" since 1922. New York, National Committee for a Free Europe. 38pp. $.25.

Current Digest of the Soviet Press. *Current Soviet Policies: The Documentary Record of the Nineteenth Communist Party Congress and the Reorganization after Stalin's Death.* New York, Praeger. 268pp. $6.00.

Curtiss, John S. *The Russian Church and the Soviet State, 1917-1950.* Boston, Little, Brown. 387pp. $6.00.

Degras, Jane (Tabrisky) ed. *Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy.* Vol. 3, 1933-1941. New York, Oxford. 560pp. $8.50.

Delbars, Yves. *The Real Stalin;* tr. from the French by Bernard Miall. London, Allen and Unwin. 439pp. 25/.

Deutscher, Isaac. *Russia: What Next?* New York, Oxford. 230pp. $3.00.

East European Fund, Inc. *Second Annual Report, 1952-1953.* New York, The Fund. 82pp.

Ebon, Martin. *Malenkov: Stalin's Successor.* Introd. by Harry Schwartz. New York, McGraw-Hill. 284pp. $3.75.

Einsiedel, Heinrich von. *I Joined the Russians: A Captured German Flier's Diary of the Communist Temptation.* New Haven, Conn., Yale University. 306pp. $4.00.

Ewer, William N. *Communists on Peace.* London, Batchworth Press. 40pp. 1/.

Fainsod, Merle. *How Russia Is Ruled.* Cambridge, Harvard University. 575pp. $7.50.

Feather, Victor. *How Do the Com-*

munists Work? London, Batchworth Press. 64pp. 1/6.

The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1903-1953). New York, New Century. 31pp. $.15.

Florinsky, Michael T. *Russia: A History and an Interpretation.* New York, Macmillan. 2 Vols. $15.00.

From Stalin to Malenkov: the Succession to Power and Its Implication for the Soviet Sphere. New York, National Committee for a Free Europe. 30pp. $.25.

Garthoff, Raymond L. *The New Soviet Leadership.* Santa Monica, Calif., Rand Corporation. 46pp.

—. *Soviet Military Doctrine;* with a Preface by H. A. DeWeerd. Glencoe, Ill., Free Press. 587pp. $7.50.

Glaser, Kurt. *The Iron Curtain and American Policy.* Washington, Public Affairs Press. 36pp. $1.00.

Gollwitzer, Helmut. *Unwilling Journey: A Diary from Russia;* tr. [from the German] by E. M. Delacour and Robert Fenn. London, S.C.M. Press. 320pp. 16/.

Grigor'ev, Serge L. *The Diaghilev Ballet, 1909-1929;* tr. and ed. by Vera Bowen. London, Constable. 289pp. 35/.

Guerney, Bernard G., ed. *New Russian Stories;* sel. and tr. by Bernard G. Guerney. New York, New Directions. 240pp. $3.75.

Guest, Ivor F. *The Ballet of the Second Empire, 1858-1870;* with a Preface by Serge Lifar. London, A. & C. Black. 148pp. 25/.

Guirey, Chingis. *Shadow of Power.* Indianapolis, Ind., Bobbs-Merrill. 315pp. $4.00.

Gurian, Waldemar, and Others, eds. *Soviet Imperialism: Its Origins and Tactics; a Symposium.* Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame. 166pp. $3.75.

Hallström, Björn. *I Believed in Moscow;* tr. [from the Swedish] by A. C. Adcock. London, Lutterworth Press. 187pp. 10/6.

Hardy, Frank J. *Journey into the Future.* Melbourne, Australia, Australasian Book Society, 1952. 336pp. 17/6.

Harkins, William E. *Bibliography of Slavic Folk Literature.* New York, King's Crown Press. 28pp. $.90.

Hazard, John N. *Law and Social Change in the U.S.S.R.* London, Stevens & Sons. 310pp. 25/.

Hilger, Gustav, and Meyer, Alfred G. *The Incompatible Allies; a Memoir-History of German-Soviet Relations, 1918-1941.* New York, Macmillan. 350pp. $5.00.

Hindus, Maurice G. *Crisis in the Kremlin.* New York, Doubleday. 319pp. $3.95.

International Commission Against Forced Labour, comp. *Police-State Methods in the Soviet Union.* Prepared under the Direction of David Rousset. Tr. by Charles R. Joy. J. S. Gliksman, ed. Boston, Beacon Press. 64pp. $1.50.

Ionescu, P. G. *Kremlin and the Church.* Detroit, Mich., S. J. Bloch. 80pp. $1.00.

Johnstone, Archie. *In the Name of Peace.* Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1952. 152pp.

Josselson, Harry H. *Russian Word Count and Frequency Analysis of Grammatical Categories of Standard Literary Russian.* Detroit, Mich., Wayne University. 274pp. $4.00.

Kardelj, Edvard. *After Five Years: Socialist Movements and the USSR Five Years after the Yugoslav-Cominform Split, Meaning of the Events in Eastern Germany and*

Czechoslovakia, the Future of the Soviet System. New York, Yugoslav Information Center. 23pp.

King-Hall, Stephen. *The Communist Conspiracy.* New York, Macmillan. 239pp. $3.00.

Klimov, Gregory. *Terror Machine: The Inside Story of the Soviet Administration in Germany;* tr. from the German by H. C. Stevens; introd. by Edward Crankshaw and Ernst Reuter. New York, Praeger. 400pp. $4.00.

Kohanik, Peter G. *The Biggest Lie of the Century—"the Ukraine": Historical Facts Concerning Russia and "the Ukraine."* New York, Russian Orthodox Clergy Assn. of North America, 1952. 41pp. $.75.

Kohn, Hans. *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology.* Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame. 365pp. $6.25.

Kolarz, Walter. *How Russia Is Ruled.* London, Batchworth Press. 175pp. 7/6.

Konovalov, Serge, ed. *Russian Prose Composition: Selected Passages for Translation into Russian.* London, Oxford. 88pp. 4/6.

Konstantinovsky, Boris A. *Soviet Law in Action: The Recollected Cases of a Soviet Lawyer.* Ed. by H. J. Berman. Cambridge, Harvard University. 77pp. $1.50.

Korol, Nestor. *The Introduction of New Plants in Soviet Agriculture: Supervision and Control.* New York, Research Program on the U.S.S.R. 16pp. $.30.

Krushchev, N. *On Changes in the Rules of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Rules of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Adopted Unanimously by the Nineteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.* New York, New Century. 47pp. $.25.

Krymov, Vladimir P. *The Impenitent Midge;* tr. from the Russian by Alec Brown. London, The Bodley Head. 199pp. 12/6.

Krypton, Constantine, pseud. *The Northern Sea Route; Its Place in Russian Economic History before 1917.* Foreword by Michael M. Karpovich. New York, Research Program on the U.S.S.R. 194pp. $2.25.

Kyaw Min, U. *Through the Iron Curtain via the Back Door.* London, Benn. 287pp. 10/6.

Larsky, N. W. *The Russia That I Loved.* London, McSwinnie: Simpkin. 190pp. 3/6.

Leites, Nathan. *A Study of Bolshevism.* Glencoe, Ill., Free Press. 639pp. $6.50.

Lenin, Vladimir I. *Selected Works.* London, Lawrence & Wishart. 4 Vols. 20/.

Lowinsky, Ruth. *Russian Food for Pleasure; Modern Recipes,* tr. by Lance Thirkell. London, Hart-Davis. 100pp. 7/6.

Lyons, Eugene. *Our Secret Allies: The Peoples of Russia.* Boston, Little, Brown. New York, Duell. 376pp. $4.50.

MacIntyre, Alasdair C. *Marxism; An Interpretation.* London, S.C.M. Press. 126pp. 8/6.

Magidoff, Robert. *The Kremlin vs. the People: The Story of the Cold Civil War in Stalin's Russia.* New York, Doubleday. 288pp. $3.50.

Malenkov, Georgii M. *On the Threshold of Communism: Report to the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.* New York, New Century, 1952. 94pp. $.35.

—. *Speech at the Session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, August 8, 1953.* [Tr. from the Russian.] London, Soviet News. 41pp. 2d.

Manning, Clarence A. *Ukraine un-*

der the Soviets. New York, Bookman Associates. 223pp. $3.50.

—. *Russian Influence on Early America*. New York, Library Publishers. 216pp. $3.75.

Martovych, Oleh R. (pseud.) *Ukrainian Liberation Movement in Modern Times*. Introd. by John F. Stewart. Edinburgh, Scottish League for European Freedom. 777pp. 5/.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Frederick. *Letters to Americans, 1848-1895; a Selection* ed. by Alexander Trachtenberg; tr. by Leonard E. Mins. New York, International Publishers. 312pp. $4.00.

Matthews, William K. *The Structure and Development of Russian*. New York, Cambridge University Press. 224pp. $6.00.

Minorskii, Vladimir F. *Studies in Caucasian History*. London, Valentine, Mitchell. 200pp. 35/.

Molotov, Viacheslav M. and Others. *For Communism and Peace: Reports to the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. New York, New Century, 1952. 49pp. $.25.

Monnerot, Jules. *Sociology and Psychology of Communism*. Boston, Beacon Press. 339pp. $6.00.

Nechkina, Militsa V. *Russia in the Nineteenth Century;* Pt. 1, tr. by Sir Bernard Pares and Oliver J. Frederiksen. Washington, American Council of Learned Societies. 551pp. $4.50.

Nikitin, P. *Lespromkhoz as an Administrative and Production Unit*. New York, Research Program on the U.S.S.R. 82pp. $.95.

North, Robert C. *Moscow and Chinese Communists*. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University. 306pp. $5.00.

Okinshevych, Lev. *The Law of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: Background and Bibliography*. New York, Research Program on the U.S.S.R. 53pp.

Orlov, Alexander. *The Secret History of Stalin's Crimes*. New York, Random House. 366pp. $4.50.

Osipov, A. *The Resumption and Development of International Economic Relations*. Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1952.

Pares, Bernard. *History of Russia:* Definitive ed., with a New Introd. by Richard Pares. New York, Knopf. 611pp. $7.50.

Pargment, Lila. *Modern Russian Reader; For Intermediate Classes*. New York, Pitman. 231pp. $2.75.

Parkins, Maurice F. *City Planning in Soviet Russia, with an Interpretative Bibliography*. Chicago, University of Chicago. 257pp. $6.00.

Pisko, E. S. *Stalin's Hoax on the Communists*. Boston, Beacon Press. 36pp. $.50.

Plamenatz, John (P.). *From Marx to Stalin*. London, Batchworth Press. 48pp. 1/6.

Possony, Stefan T. *A Century of Conflict: Communist Techniques of World Revolution*. New York, Henry Regnery. 439pp. $7.50.

Povest' vremennykh let. *Russian Primary Chronicle;* Laurentian Text; tr. and ed. by Samuel Hazzard Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor. Cambridge, Medieval Academy of America. 313pp. $5.00.

Raud, Villibald. *Estonia: a Reference Book*. New York, Nordic Press. 158pp. $2.50.

The Red and the Black; the Church in the Communist State. New York, National Committee for a Free Europe. 75pp. $.50.

Rodin, N. W. *Productivity in Soviet*

Iron Mining, 1890-1960. Santa Monica, Calif., Rand Corporation. 49pp.

Romanov, Boris A. *Russia in Manchuria, 1892-1906;* tr. from the Russian by Susan W. Jones. Ann Arbor, Mich., Edwards Brothers, 1952. 549pp. $6.00.

Rostow, Walt W., and Levin, Alfred. *The Dynamics of Soviet Society.* New York, Norton. 282pp. $3.95.

Rounds, Frank, Jr. *A Window on Red Square.* Boston, Houghton, Mifflin. 304pp. $3.00.

Rules of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. (Adopted by the Nineteenth Party Congress) Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House. 31pp.

Runes, Dagobert D. *Soviet Impact on Society: A Recollection;* with a Foreword by Harry E. Barnes. New York, Philosophical Library. 202pp. $3.75.

Russia (1923— U.S.S.R.) Constitution. *Facts about the Constitution of the U.S.S.R.* [n.p.] 63pp.

Russian Icons; Introd. by Philipp Schweinfurth. London, Oxford. 74pp. $6.50.

Saburov, M. *Report on the Directives of the Nineteenth Party Congress Relating to the Fifth Five-Year Plan for the Development of the U.S.S.R. in 1951-1955* [*Moscow*], *October 8, 1952.* Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1952. 72pp.

Sassoon, Penelope. *Penelope in Moscow.* London, Weidenfield & Nicolson. 157pp. 12/6.

Sethi, Surjit S. *Stalin Lives On: A Narrative of His Life and Struggle.* New Delhi, India, Cosmopolitan Publications. 247pp. Rs3.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. *From Lenin to Malenkov: The History of World Communism.* New York, Praeger. 377pp. $6.00.

Shimkin, Demitri B. *Minerals: A Key to Soviet Power.* Cambridge, Harvard University. 452pp. $8.00.

Simmons, Ernest J., ed. *Through the Glass of Soviet Literature: Views of Russian Society.* New York, Columbia University. 301pp. $4.50.

Slonim, Marc L. *Modern Russian Literature; from Chekhov to the Present.* New York, Oxford. 467pp. $6.80.

Slusser, Robert, ed. *Soviet Economic Policy in Postwar Germany: A Collection of Papers by Former Soviet Officials.* New York, Research Program on the U.S.S.R. 184pp. $2.25.

Stalin, Josif V. *Works.* Vols. 1-4, 1901-1920. London, Lawrence & Wishart. 20/.

Stalin: A Self Portrait. New York, Farrar, Straus & Young. 64pp. $1.00.

Steinberg, Isaac N. *In the Workshop of the Revolution.* New York, Rinehart. 306pp. $4.00.

Sternberg, Fritz. *The End of a Revolution: Soviet Russia—From Revolution to Reaction.* Tr. from the German by Edward Fitzgerald. New York, John Day. 191pp. $3.00.

Stevens, Leslie C. *Russian Assignment.* Boston, Little, Brown. 568pp. $5.75.

Stolz, George, comp. *Satellite Economy and Labor: A Tentative Bibliography with Regard to Recent Publications on Soviet Russia.* New York, National Committee for a Free Europe. 17pp.

Survey of International Affairs, 1939-1946. [Vol. 3]: "America, Britain, and Russia: Their Co-operation and Conflict, 1941-1946," by Wil-

liam H. McNeill. New York, Oxford. 819pp. $15.00.

Tetens, Tete H. *Germany Plots with the Kremlin.* New York, Schuman. 294pp. $3.75.

Thomas, Ann V. *Communism Versus International Law: Today's Clash of Ideals;* Foreword by Robert G. Storey. Dallas, Texas, Southern Methodist University. 145pp. $3.75.

Tomašić, Dinko A. *The Impact of Russian Culture on Soviet Communism.* Glencoe, Ill., Free Press. 287pp. $4.50.

Tompkins, Stuart R. *Russian Mind;* Vol. 1, *From Peter the Great through the Enlightenment.* Norman, Okla., University of Oklahoma. 302pp. $5.25.

Trotsky, Leon. *The First Five Years of the Communist International.* Vol. 2; tr. from the Russian and ed. by John G. Wright. New York, Pioneer Publishers. London, New Park Publications. 384pp. 12/6.

Unbegaun, Boris O., and Simmons, J. S. G. *A Bibliographical Guide to the Russian Language.* New York, Oxford. 174pp. $5.00.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. *Favoring Extension of Diplomatic Relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia. Hearing, before the Special Subcommittee on H. Con. Res. 58, July 15, 1953.* Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 112pp.

—. *Joining with President of United States in a Declaration regarding Subjugation of Free Peoples by Soviet Union, Hearing, 83rd Congress, 1st Session, on H. J. Res. 200.* Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 61pp.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Un-American Activities. *Soviet Schedule for War, 1955. Executive Hearings, May 13-14, 1953.* Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 32pp.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. *Nomination of Charles Bohlen, Hearings, 83rd Congress, 1st Session, on the Nomination of . . . to Be United States Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, March 2 and 18, 1953.* Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 128pp.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Operations. *Control of Trade with Soviet Bloc, Hearings, Pursuant to S. Res. 40 . . . March 30-May 20, 1953.* Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 155pp.

—. *Control of Trade with the Soviet Bloc. Interim Report . . . Pursuant to S. Res. 40, July 21, 1953.* (*S. Rpt. 606*). Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 57pp.

—. *Transfer of Occupation Currency Plates; Espionage Phase. Interim Report . . . Made by . . . Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Subcommittee on Government Operations Abroad, Pursuant to S. Res. 40.* (S. Rpt. 837). 16pp. *Hearing . . . October 20 and 21, 1953.* Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 16pp.

—. *Communist Infiltration in the Army: Hearings, September 21-28, 1953, before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Pursuant to S. Res. 40. Pts. 1-2, 1953-1954.* Washington, Govt. Print. Off. 105pp.

U. S. Library of Congress. Reference Department. *Manufacturing and Mechanical Engineering in Soviet Union, Bibliography.* Washington, Library of Congress, Card Division. 234pp. $1.60.

—. Slavic Division. *Russian,*

Ukrainian and Belorussian Newspapers, 1917-1953, Union List; comp. by Paul L. Horecky. Washington, Library of Congress, Card Division. 218pp. $1.45.

U. S. Dept. of State. Division of Library and Reference Services. *American Correspondents and Journalists in Moscow, 1917-1952, Bibliography of their Books on USSR.* Washington, Dept. of State. 52pp.

—. *Soviet Bibliography, January 14-June 17, 1953.* (Publication Discontinued) Washington, Dept. of State. Fortnightly.

—. Office of Intelligence Research. *Soviet Union as Reported by Former Soviet Citizens. Interview Report No. 7, June 4, 1953.* Washington, Dept. of State.

—. *Unpublished Research on the USSR, Completed or in Progress, April, 1953.* Washington, Dept. of State. 21pp.

Uustalu, Evald. *The History of the Estonian People.* London, Boreas. 266pp. 21/.

Vernadsky, George. *Mongols and Russia.* (History of Russia, Vol. 3) New Haven, Conn., Yale University. 473pp. $7.50.

Vickers, Steve B. *Europe and the U.S.S.R.* London, Educational Publishing Co. 174pp. 7/.

Weiant, Edmund T. *Sources of Modern Mass Atheism in Russia.* College Park, Md., The Author. 142pp. $3.00.

Weiss, Victor (Vicky, pseud.) *Meet the Russians,* by Vicky. London, Reinhardt. 60pp. 10/6.

Willan, Thomas S. *The Muscovy Merchants of 1555.* Manchester, Eng., Manchester University. 141pp. 16/.

Young, [George] Gordon [Fussell] *Stalin's Heirs;* with a Foreword by Sir David Kelly. London, Verschoyle. 156pp. 12/6.

Zen'kovskii, Vasilii V. *A History of Russian Philosophy;* Authorized Translation from the Russian by George L. Kline. New York, Columbia University. 2 Vols. $15.00.

—. *Russian Thinkers and Europe;* tr. from the Russian by Galia S. Bodde. Washington, American Council of Learned Societies. 199pp. $2.50.

II ARTICLES[2]

Abrahamson, S. R. "Petroleum in the Soviet Union: An Appraisal of a Recent German Study." *Economic Geography,* XXIX:267-276, July.

Adams, A. E. "The Character of Pestel's Thought." *American Slavic and East European Review,* XII:153-161, April.

—. "Pobedonostev and the Rule of Firmness." *Slavonic and East European Review,* XXXII:132-139, December.

Alavi, H. A. "A First Look at Soviet Russia." *Pakistan Horizon,* V:75-86, June 1952.

Albjerg, V. L. "The Leaders of Soviet Russia." *Current History,* XXV:101-106, August.

Anthem, T. "Russia and the Bal-

[2]In general, short articles in monthlies have been excluded as are all articles in weeklies, semimonthlies and fortnightlies. This listing is based on articles in quarterly and monthly journals, omitting articles on life in the satellites.

kans." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXXIV:10-15, July.

Ascher, A. "The Kornilov Affair." *Russian Review*, XII:235-252, October.

"Asia after Stalin: Prospects of the Russo-Chinese Alliance." *Round Table*, No. 171: 207-213, June.

Atkinson, J. D. "The Communist Revolution in Warfare." *Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute*, LXXIX:84-91, March.

Bahrianyj, I. "Is Revolution Possible in the U.S.S.R.?" *Eastern Quarterly*, VI:36-39, January-April.

Bailey, S. D. "Bolshevism and Nihilism." *Fortnightly*, CLXXVIII (n.s. CLXXII):188-193, March.

Baron, S. H. "Plekhanov on Russian Capitalism and the Peasant Commune, 1883-1885." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:463-474, December.

Bauer, R. A. "The Implications of the Succession Crisis in the Soviet Union for East-West Relations." *Social Problems* I:38-43, October.

Baykov, A. "A Note on the Economic Significance of Compulsory Labour in the U.S.S.R." *Bulletins on Soviet Economic Development*, 30-41, December 1952.

—. "Post-War Economic Development in the U.S.S.R." *Bulletins on Soviet Economic Development*, 1-48, May.

Beloff, M. "The Foundation of Soviet Foreign Policy." *Soviet Studies*, V:151-158, October.

Bentwich, N. D. "Soviet-Jewish Conflict." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXXIII:261-266, May.

Beria, L. "Firm Friendship of Peoples." *New World Review*, XX: 37-43, December 1952.

"Beria: Leader or Traitor?" *World Today*, IX:323-326, August.

Bernal, J. D. "The Answer to the Hydrogen Bomb." *Labour Monthly*, XXXV:554-560, December.

Bernard, S. "Choice in the West." *World Politics*, V:133-167, January.

Bertensson, S. "Fokine: A Memory." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:378-390, October.

"Bibliography: Books, Pamphlets, and Articles on Russia Published in 1952." *Russian Review*, XII: 206-222, July.

Blit, L. "The Party of Lenin and Stalin." *Socialist Commentary*, XVI:233-235ff., October 1952.

—. "Soviet Colonialism." *Socialist Commentary*, XVII:20-22, January.

Blum, J. "The 'Smerd' in Kievan Russia." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:122-130, February.

Bock, M. S. "Stolypin in Saratov." *Russian Review*, XII:187-193, July.

Boldyreff, C. W. "Whither the Red Army?" *World Affairs*, CXVI: 78-80, Fall.

Borman, A. "Peter Struve's Escape from Soviet Russia." *Russian Review*, XII:42-50, January. Struve, G. "Reply." *Ibid.*, pp. 134-135, April.

Brasol, B., tr. "From Pushkin's Poems." *Russian Review*, XII: 40-41, January.

Brodiansky, N. "Turgenev's Short Stories. A Revaluation." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXII:70-91, December.

Brogan, D. W. "Who Is the Enemy?" *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXIX:339-350, Summer.

Bromley-Gardner, R. "Russia—and the Austrian Treaty." *Army Quarterly*, LXV:56-60, October 1952.

Browder, R. P. "The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Comintern, 1933-1935." *Russian Review*, XII:25-39, January.

Brown, B. E. "The United Front Tactics of International Communism." *Problems of Communism*, II: No. 5:9-17.

Brown, D. "O. Henry in Russia." *Russian Review*, XII:253-258, October.

—. "Sinclair Lewis: The Russian View." *American Literature*, XXV:1-12, March.

Bruhns, F. C. "The Appeal of Communism." *Pacific Spectator*, VI:413-427, Autumn 1952.

Brumberg, A. "The Soviet Campaign against 'Survivals of Capitalism'." *Russian Review*, XII: 65-78, April.

Burns, E. "Stalin's Development of the Theory of the State." *Communist Review*, 126-128, April.

—. "Stalin's Great New Contribution." *Communist Review*, 355-363, December 1952.

Cadogan, A. "Must History Repeat Itself?" *World Affairs*, CXV:101-104, Winter 1952.

Cairncross, A. "The Moscow Economic Conference." *Soviet Studies*, IV:113-132, October 1952.

"Collective Agreements in the U.S.S.R.: Analysis of the Present Soviet Conception of Such Agreements." *International Labour Review*, LXVI:477-484, November/December 1952.

Caroe, O. "Soviet Colonialism in Central Asia." *Foreign Affairs*, XXXII:135-144, October.

Carr, E. H. "The Background of Revolution." *Current History*, XXV:65-69, August.

—. "Stalin." *Soviet Studies*, V:1-7, July.

Chamberlin, W. H. "Ten Fallacies about Communism." *Russian Review*, XII:139-152, July.

Civic, M. "England and Moscow: Earnings and Living Standards." *Conference Board Business Record*, X:88-92, February.

Clarke, G. "Stalin's Role—Stalinism's Future." *Fourth International*, XIV:5-13, January.

Coogan, J. "Bread and the Soviet Fiscal System." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, XXXV:161-167, May.

Coombs, G. M. "Russo-Scandinavian Relations." *International Journal*, VIII:41-45, Winter 1952-1953.

Cressey, G. B. "Changing the Map of the Soviet Union." *Economic Geography*, XXIX:198-207, July.

Dallin, D. J. "The New Russian Intelligentsia." *Yale Review*, XLIII:188-203, December.

Daniels, R. V. "The Soviet Succession: Lenin and Stalin." *Russian Review*, XII:153-172, July.

—. "The State and Revolution: A Case Study in the Genesis and Transformation of Communist Ideology." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:22-43, February.

Davies, R. W. "Finance." *Bulletins on Soviet Economic Development*, 1-21, December 1952.

—. "Short-Term Credit in the USSR: Some Postwar Problems." *Soviet Studies*, V:18-31, July.

"Declaration of Caucasian Emigrés." *Eastern Quarterly*, VI:54-55, January-April.

Demaitre, E. "The Life and Death of the Politburo." *United Nations World*, 28-31ff., November 1952.

Deutscher, I. "The Beria Affair." *International Journal*, 227-239, Autumn.

—. "Dogma and Reality in Stalin's

Economic Problems." *Soviet Studies*, IV:349-363, April.

—. "The Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." *International Affairs*, XXIX:149-155, April.

Dobb, M. "Rates of Growth under the Five-Year Plans." *Soviet Studies*, IV:364-385, April.

Dobriansky, L. E. "Soviet Simulation of Ukrainian Independence." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, VIII:239-245, Summer 1952.

Dvoichenko-Markov, E. "Russian Traveler to Eighteenth-Century America." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, XCVII:350-355, September 28th.

—. "William Penn and Peter the Great." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, XCVII: 12-25, February 14th.

"Earnings and Living Standards in Moscow: A Comment," by G. H. Elvin; "A Rejoinder," by T. Schulz and P. Wiles. *Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics*, XV:309-326, September.

Eaton, J. "Stalin's Contribution to Economic Theory." *Communist Review*, 120-126, April.

Edgerton, W. B. "Leskov and Tolstoy: Two Literary Heretics." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:524-534, December.

Erlich, V. "Russian Formalist Movement." *Partisan Review*, XX:282-296, May.

"The Exchange of Scientific Information with the Soviet Union." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist*, IX:13-15ff., February.

"Fall of Beria and the Nationalities Question in the U.S.S.R." *World Today*, IX:481-497, November.

Fedotov, G. "The Fate of Empires." *Russian Review*, XII:83-94, April.

Fedynskyj, J. "Sovietization of an Occupied Area through the Medium of the Courts (Northern Bukovina)." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:44-56, February.

Feldmesser, R. A. "The Persistence of Status Advantages in Soviet Russia." *American Journal of Sociology*, LIX:19-27, July.

Ferrell, J. "The Tenses of the Russian Verb." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXII:108-116, December.

Field, M. G. "Structured Strain in the Role of the Soviet Physician." *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII:493-502, March.

"The Fifth Five-Year Plan of the Soviet Union: [text of] Draft Directives for the Fifth Five Year Plan, Translated from a Moscow Radio Broadcast." *Current History*, XXIV:43-55, January.

Fisher, M. "A Third World War in Communist Theory." *Social Studies*, XLIV:9-13, January.

Florinsky, M. T. "Soviet Economic Policies." *Current History*, XXV: 93-100, August.

Froomkin, J. and Jaffe, A. J. "Occupational Skill and Socioeconomic Structure." *American Journal of Sociology*, LIX:42-48, July.

Gannett, B. "Towards a Society of Abundance: On the Thirty-Sixth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution." *Political Affairs*, XXXII:20-35, November.

Garthoff, R. L. "Ideological Concepts in Soviet Foreign Policy." *Problems of Communism*, II No. 5:1-8.

Gasiorowska, X. "Villains, Heroes and Superheroes in Soviet Literature Today." *Antioch Review*, XIII:14-22, March.

Gaster, J., and Hostettler, J. "Notes on Soviet Legal Theory." *Communist Review*, 344-352, November.

Gecys, C. C. "Equality of Rights of the Soviet Nationalities." *Russian Review*, XII:100-110, April.

Germain, E. "Economic Problems of Transition Epoch: The Soviet Bureaucracy in the Mirror of Stalin's Latest Work [entitled, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*]" *Fourth International*, XIII:179-192, November 1952.

Glasgow, G. "Change of Heart." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXXIII:370-376, June.

Goldbloom, M. J. "Stalin Builds a Trojan Horse against America: Warning, Another 'Popular Front' in the Making." *Commentary*, XIV:403-412, November 1952.

Golubeva, V. "New Dignity for Women." *New World Review*, XXI:30-36, March.

Goodman, E. R. "The Soviet Union and World Government." *Journal of Politics*, XV:231-253, May.

Grossman, G. "Scarce Capital and Soviet Doctrine." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, LXVII:311-343, August.

Guillebaud, P. "The Role of Honorary Awards in the Soviet Economic System." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII: 486-505, December.

Guins, G. C. "The Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R." *Russian Review*, XII:269-278, October.

—. "Russian Communism and the Dilemma of Power." *International Journal*, VIII:83-89, Spring.

Guri, D. "The Tito-Stalin Struggle." *World Affairs Interpreter*, XXIII:159-165, Summer 1952.

Haffner, S. "Meaning of Malenkov." *Twentieth Century*, CLIII: 326-334, May.

Hammond, M. K. "Current Books on the Soviet Union." *Current History*, XXV:127-129, August.

Hayward, H. M. "Eternal Triangle in Soviet Literature." *Twentieth Century*, CLIII:219-225, March.

Hazard, J. N. "A Political Testament for Stalin's Heirs." *International Journal*, VIII:75-82, Spring.

—. "Soviet Property Law and Social Change." *British Journal of Sociology*, IV:1-13, March.

Heimann, E. "Atheist Theocracy." *Social Research*, XX:311-331, October.

—. "Marxism and the Underdeveloped Countries." *Social Research*, XIX:322-325, September 1952.

Historicus, pseud. "Is There Really a Russian Underground Friendly to America?" *Ukrainian Quarterly*, VIII:251-257, Summer 1952.

Hittle, J. D. "The Basis of Sino-Soviet Accord." *Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute*, LXXIX:372-381, April.

Hodgman, D. R. "Soviet Machinery Output." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII: 57-71, February.

Hodin, J. P. "Soviet Attitude toward Art." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXXIII:346-350, June.

Hoeffding, O. "East-West Trade Possibilities: An Appraisal of the Moscow Economic Conference." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:350-359, October.

Holzman, F. D. "The Burden of Soviet Taxation." *American Economic Review*, XLIII:548-571, September.

—. "The Soviet Budget, 1928-1952." *National Tax Journal*, VI:226-249, September.

"How Business Gets Done in Rus-

sia." *Fortune*, XLVII:122-124ff., February.

Hulička, K. "Political Education in Soviet Schools." *Soviet Studies*, V:138-150, October.

Inge, W. R. "Russian Theology." *Hibbert Journal*, LI:107-112, January.

Ingram, K. "The Soviet Union." *One World*, IV:178-182, October 1952.

Inkeles, A. "The Soviet Attack on the Voice of America: A Case Study in Propaganda Warfare." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:319-342, October.

Ivask, G. "George Fedotov (1886-1951)" *Russian Review*, XII:79-82, April.

Jenkins, A. "Soviet Foreign Policy." *Communist Review*, 304-309, October 1952.

Joules, H. "Soviet Medicine Today." *New World Review*, XXI: 43-48, February.

Kaplan, N. M. "Arithmancy, Theomancy, and the Soviet Economy." *Journal of Political Economy*, LXI:93-116, April.

Kaufman, A. "The Origin of the 'Political Economy of Socialism': An Essay on Soviet Economic Thought." *Soviet Studies*, IV:243-272, January.

Kawalkowski, A. "Surrender or Liberation." *Eastern Quarterly*, V:10-18, August/October 1952.

Kennan, G. F. "The Growth of the Soviet Menace: It Was, and Is, 'a Function of the West's Own Weakness'; To Meet It We Must Be Strong, United, Responsible." *Johns Hopkins Magazine*, 10-11ff., October.

Kersten, C. J. "The Liberation Policy and International Order." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXXXVIII:93-104, July.

Klesment, J. "The Crime: Seizure and Forced 'Incorporation'; Pre-War Political Relations between the Baltic Republic and the USSR; Violation of Treaties and Aggression." *Baltic Review*, 5-14, December.

Klugmann, J. "On the Road to Communism." *Labour Monthly*, XXXIV:497-505, November 1952.

—. "Stalin and Dialectical Materialism." *Communist Review*, 137-140, May; 171-179, June.

—. "The U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies." *Communist Review*, 329-337, November 1952.

Komarnicki, T. "Should Russia's Neighbours Be 'Friendly' or Independent Countries?" *Eastern Quarterly*, VI:2-10, October-December.

Korostovets, V. K. "Memories of Witte." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXXIV:85-89, August.

Koutaissoff, E. "Soviet Education and the New Man." *Soviet Studies*, V:103-137, October.

Krushchev, N. S. "Changes in the Rules of the C.P.S.U.: Extracts from [his] Report on Changes in the Rules at the Nineteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U." *Communist Review*, 363-370, December 1952.

Krushinskiy, S. "Compulsory School Attendance and the Schools in Soviet Byelorussia." *Eastern Quarterly*, VI:44-48, October-December.

Krynski, G. I. "Management Problems in Soviet Public Enterprise as Indicated by Arbitration Awards." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:175-187, April.

Kulski, W. W. "Class Stratifications in the Soviet Union." *For-*

eign Affairs, XXXII:145-153, October.

—. "Present Trends in Soviet International Law." *Proceedings of the American Society of International Law*, 59-67, 1953 (47th annual meeting).

—. "Soviet Comments on International Law and International Relations." *American Journal of International Law*, XLVII:125-134, 308-314, 485-491, January-July.

Lazitch, B. "Early Days of the Cominform." *Eastern Quarterly*, VI:46-51, January-April.

Leech, C., and Leech, J. "Our Eyes Did Not Deceive Us: Canadian Couple Reports on Visit to Soviet Union." *New World Review*, XXI:4-10, January.

Leichter, O. "The New Stalinism." *Progressive*, XVII:13-15, March.

Lerner, D. "The Role of Brains in the Total State." *Commentary*, XVI:167-173, August.

Leshem, M. "Soviet Propaganda in the Middle East." *Middle Eastern Affairs*, IV:1-10, January.

Levitskiy, B. "In the Ukraine after Stalin's Death." *Eastern Quarterly*, VI:11-16, October-December.

Lichtheim, G. "Cold War Perspective—without Stalin: Why Soviet Expansion May Now Accelerate." *Commentary*, XV:338-345, April.

Lipski, A. "Foundations of the Russian Academy of Sciences." *Isis*, XLIV, Pt. 4:349-354.

"Living Standards under Malenkov." *Twentieth Century*, CLIV: 173-181, September.

Loewenthal, R. "Retreat from Stalinism." *Twentieth Century*, CLIV:414-425, December.

—. "Stalin's Testament." *Twentieth Century*, CLIII:180-194, March.

London, I. D. "Therapy in Soviet Psychiatric Hospitals." *American Psychologist*, VIII:79-82, February.

Lyons, L. "Russians Are People." *Freeman*, III:523-525, April 20.

McLean, H. "Leskov and Ioann of Kronstadt." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:93-108, February.

Madge, C. "Notes on the Standard of Living in Moscow, April, 1952." *Soviet Studies*, IV:229-236, January.

"Malenkov's Economic Inheritance." *Banker* (London), C:191-196, April.

"Malenkov's Secret Weapon." *Monthly Review*, V:255-261, October.

Malnick, B. "A. A. Shakhovskoy." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXII:29-51, December.

Malyshev, I. "National Income of the U.S.S.R." *Communist Review*, 378-381, December.

Margolin, J. "Do We Leave the Russian Jews to Their Fate?" *Commentary*, XVI:321-327, October.

Martin, J.-P. "Democracy and the Workers' Rule." *Fourth International*, XIV:25-31, January.

Martinet, G. "The Future of Communism." *Monthly Review*, V:7-12, May.

Mathewson, R. W. "The Soviet Hero and the Literary Heritage." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:506-523, December.

Matthews, W. K. "The Russian Language before 1700." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXI:364-387, June.

Mazour, A. G. "Party Line History." *American Scholar*, XXII: 293-303, Summer.

Megay, E. N. "Lysenkoism and the

Stateless Society." *Journal of Politics*, XV:211-230, May.
Meister, C. W. "Chekhov's Reception in England and America." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:109-121, February.
Meyer, A. G. "Soviet Philosophy: Bolshevism, a Modification of Marxism, Has Developed in a Peculiarly Russian Fashion." *Current History*, XXV:70-75, August.
Meyer, P. "Soviet Anti-Semitism in High Gear: What Does the Kremlin Hope to Gain?" *Commentary*, XV:115-120, February.
Miller, J. "Note on the Standard of Living in Moscow in 1937." *Soviet Studies*, IV:237-242, January.
—. "A Political Economy of Socialism in the Making." *Soviet Studies*, IV:403-433, April.
Millikan, G. W. "The Science of Soviet Politics." *Foreign Affairs*, XXXI:472-485, April.
Moran, L. "Catholicism, Communism, and Science." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist*, IX:49-53ff., March.
Morley, C. "Czartoryski's Attempts at a New Foreign Policy under Alexander I." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII: 475-485, December.
Morris, B. S. "The Cominform—a Five Year Perspective." *World Politics*, V:368-376, April.
Mosely, P. E. "The Kremlin's Foreign Policy since Stalin." *Foreign Affairs*, XXXII:20-33, October.
—. "The Nineteenth Party Congress." *Foreign Affairs*, XXXI: 238-256, January.
Muchnic, H. "Alexander Blok." *Russian Review*, XII:16-24, January.
Mukherjee, U. "Sino-Soviet Relations in Their Retrospect (1860-1950)." *Modern Review*, XCIV: 40-46, July.
Muste, A. J. "Superman or Superstate for the Soviets?" *Progressive*, XVII:12-14, July.
Nash, E. "Purchasing Power of Soviet Workers, 1953." *Monthly Labor Review*, LXXVI:705-708, July.
Nove, A. "Rural Taxation in the USSR." *Soviet Studies*, V:159-166, October.
— and Laird, R. D. "A Note on Labour Utilization in the Kolkhoz." *Soviet Studies*, IV:434-442, April.
O'Brien, C. B. "Russia and Turkey, 1677-1681: The Treaty of Bakhchisarai." *Russian Review*, XII: 159-268, October.
Orel, H. "The Forgotten Ambassadors: Russian Fiction in Victorian England." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:371-377, October.
Ornstein, J. "Facilities and Activities of the Library of Congress in the Slavic and East European Field." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:549-554, December.
Pablo, M. "The Nineteenth Congress of the Russian C. P." *Fourth International*, XIII:169-173, November.
—. "The Post-Stalin 'New Course.' " *Fourth International*, XIV:35-39, March.
Parker, R. "Stalingrad: Triumph of Life." *Masses and Mainstream*, VI:16-22, April.
Parkins, M. F. "Soviet Policy on Urban Housing and Housing Rent." *Land Economics*, XXIX: 269-279, August.
Parry, A. " 'Free Enterprise'—Russian Style." *Commerce Magazine*, 12-14ff., October.
"Party and Government Re-Organi-

zation in the U.S.S.R." *Current Notes on International Affairs* (Australia Dept. of External Affairs), XXIV:97-114, March.

Pavliuk, M. "The Modern Nationalism of the Russians." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, VIII:364-370, Autumn 1952.

Pervukhin, M. G. "The Thirty-Fifth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution." *Political Affairs*, XXXI:1-17, November 1952.

Plunkett, R. L. "China Views Her Russian Tutor." *Far Eastern Survey*, XXII:95-101, July.

Polyzoides, A. T. "The Soviet Union in Transition." *World Affairs Interpreter*, XXIV:284-293, October.

"*Pravda* on the Role of the Party and of the Individual." *Soviet Studies*, V:208-212, October.

"Premier Malenkov's Report" [to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., August 8, 1953: Comment and Explanation] *New World Review*, XXI:5-16, September.

"The Preparations for the Party Congress." *Soviet Studies*, IV:296-334, January.

Price, M. P. "After Stalin." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXXIII: 257-261, May.

—. "What Has Happened in Russia?" *Contemporary Review*, CLXXXIV:129-134, September.

Protsiuk, S. Y. "The Transportation in Ukraine in 1951." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, VIII:208-219, Summer 1952.

Radkey, O. H. "Alternative to Bolshevism: The Program of Russian Social Revolutionism." *Journal of Modern History*, XXV:25-39, March.

Raeff, M. "American View of the Decembrist Revolt." *Journal of Modern History*, XXV:286-293, September.

—. "The Philosophical Views of Count M. M. Speransky." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXI:437-451, June.

—. "The Political Philosophy of Speranskij." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:1-21, February.

Redding, A. D. "Employment and Labour Productivity in USSR Railroads, 1928-1950." *Soviet Studies*, V:32-43, July.

Reichard, R. W. "German Working Class and the Russian Revolution of 1905." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, XIII:136-153, July.

"A Report on Russia." *Fortune*, XLVII:111-129ff., February.

Reshetar, J. S., Jr. "National Deviation in the Soviet Union." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:162-174, April.

Riasanovsky, N. V. "Fourierism in Russia: An Estimate of the Petraševcy." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII: 289-302, October.

Rigby, T. H. "Changing Composition of the Supreme Soviet." *Political Quarterly*, XXIV:307-316, July.

Roland, A. "Christian Implications in Anti-Stalinist Novels." *Religion in Life*, XXII:400-412, July.

"The Role of the Soviet Party Congress." *World Today*, VIII: 412-419, October 1952.

Ronimois, H. E. "Soviet Economic Planning and the Balance of Power." *International Journal*, VIII:32-40, Winter 1952-1953.

Rossi, P. H., and Bauer, R. A. "Some Patterns of Soviet Communications Behavior." *Public*

Opinion Quarterly, XVI:653-666, Winter 1952-1953.

Roucek, J. S. "Government and Law in Russia." *Current History*, XXV:86-92, August.

—. "Nazi and Soviet Techniques of 'Extended Strategy.'" *Social Science*, XXVIII:160-170, June.

Rounds, F., Jr. "Report from Moscow." *Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York Monthly Bulletin*, XLIV:212-221, January.

Rudin, H. R. "On the Nature of Soviet Imperialism: The Continuity of Russian Imperialism." Dallin, D. J. "Communist Innovations." *Yale Review*, XLII: 333-350, March.

Rudzinski, A. W. "Soviet Peace Offensives." *International Conciliation*, No. 490:175-225, April.

"Russian Studies in the University [Great Britain]." *University Quarterly*, VII:223-246, May.

Sandler, A. "Stalin and Hitler: A Lesson in Comparison." *Pacific Spectator*, VII:152-166, Spring.

Schattmann, S. "Trade behind the Curtain." *Banker* (London), CI: 359-366, December.

Schlesinger, R. "Notes on the Changing Functions of Party Congresses." *Soviet Studies*, IV: 386-402, April.

Schultz, T., and Wiles, P. "Earnings and Living Standards in Moscow." *Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics*, XIV:309-326, September-October 1952.

Schuman, F. L. "The Geographic Setting." *Current History*, XXV: 76-80, August.

Schwartz, S. M. "New Light on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." *Problems of Communism*, II No. 2:11-13.

Senn, A., comp. "American Bibliography for 1952: East European Languages and Literatures." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, LXVIII:185-186, April.

Seton-Watson, H. "The Colonial System of the U.S.S.R.: Soviet Communism and the Backward Peoples." *Commentary*, XV:508-512, May.

—. "Moscow and the West." *Fortnightly*, CLXXX (n.s. CLXXIV): 147-153, September.

—. "The Problems of Stalinism." *Fabian International Review*, 6-9, May.

Shabad, T. "The Soviet Concept of Economic Regionalization." *Geographical Review*, XLIII:214-222, April.

—. "Statistical Sources for the Study of Soviet Geography." [abstract] *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, XLIII:191-192, June.

Shimkin, D. B., and Sanjuan, P. "Culture and World View: A Method of Analysis Applied to Rural Russia." *American Anthropologist*, LV:329-348, August.

Shub, D. "Kropotkin and Lenin." *Russian Review*, XII:227-234, October.

Siegel, A. "Does the Kremlin Fear the Russian Women." *Challenge Magazine*, 6-12, June.

Siegel, I. H. "Labor Productivity in the Soviet Union." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, XLVIII:65-78, March.

Sloan, P. "Trials and Press." *Labour Monthly*, XXXV:135-138, March.

Smith, J. "World Peace in the Balance." *New World Review*, XXI: 16-24, July.

Soloveytchik, G. "Reflections on Russia." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXXIV:193-197, October.

"Soviet Budget for 1953." *World Today*, IX:372-374, September.

"The Soviet Constitution: Complete Text of the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., including Changes Made by the Supreme Soviet on March 15, 1953." *Current History*, XXV:113-122, August.

"The Soviet Enigma: Russia's Home Front in the Cold War." *Round Table*, No. 173:15-23, December.

"Soviet Farm Policy." *Twentieth Century*, CLIV:342-353, November.

"Soviet Nationality Policy—Past and Present." *Problems of Communism*, II No. 5:22-34.

"Soviet Society: From the Dacha Set Down; the 'Classless Society' Has Evolved into a Society More Rank-Conscious than Any in the West." *Fortune*, XLVII:125-129ff., February.

"Soviet Statistics: An Essay in Interpretation." *World Today*, IX:217-230, May.

"The Soviet Union and Finland: As Seen by a Norwegian." *World Today*, IX:352-360, August.

Stalin, J. "Reader's Guide: *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*" *Political Affairs*, XXXII:67-96, June (Special Supplement).

Standley, W. H., and Ageton, A. A. "The Dilemma of Georgi Maximilianovich Malenkov." *Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute*, LXXIX:946-957, September.

Stone, W. T. "Negotiating with the Reds." *Editorial Research Reports*, II:649-665, September 17.

—. "Tests of Allied Unity." *Editorial Research Reports*, II:827-843, December 1.

Strakhovsky, L. I. "Boris Zaitsev—the Humanist." *Russian Review*, XII:95-99, April.

—. "The Historianism of Gogol." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:360-370, October.

Strémooukhoff, D. "Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine." *Speculum*, XXVIII:84-101, January.

Struve, G. "Chekhov Publishing House." *Books Abroad*, XXVII: 262-263, July.

Stscherbakiwskyj, W. "The Early Ukrainian Social Order as Reflected in Ukrainian Wedding Customs." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXI:325-351, June.

Sweet, J. V. "The Problem of Nationalities in Soviet Asia." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, IX:229-235, Summer.

Táborský, E. "Beneš and Stalin—Moscow, 1943 and 1945." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, XIII:154-181, July.

Taurer, B. "Stalin's Last Thesis." *Foreign Affairs*, XXXI:368-381, April.

Thörnqvist, C. "Old Barge-Builders' Terms from the Volga Area." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXII:140-150, December.

Timasheff, N. S. "The Impact of the Penal Law of Imperial Russia on Soviet Penal Law." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII:441-462, December.

—. "The Soviet Peoples." *Current History*, XXV:81-85, August.

Timoshenko, V. P. "New Soviet Economic Plan: Its Agricultural Aspect." *Journal of Political Economy*, LXI:489-508, December.

Towster, J. "Praesidium Replaces Politburo: To Avoid Problems of Succession." *Current History*, XXIV:1-5, January.

—. "The Soviet Union: Divide and

Rule." *Current History*, XXIV: 66-71, February.

Truog, E., and Pronin, D. T. "A Great Myth: the Russian Granary." *Land Economics*, XXIX: 200-208, August.

Tyrkova-Williams, A. "The Cadet Party." *Russian Review*, XII: 173-186, July.

"U.S.S.R. Severance of Diplomatic Relations with Israel: Text of Soviet Note [Feb. 12, 1953]; Statement by Prime Minister David Ben Gurion in the Knesset [Feb. 16, 1953]." *Middle Eastern Affairs*, IV:1-10, January.

Verulam, Lord. "East-West Trade—Moscow Revisited." *Manager*, XXI:513-518ff., September.

—. "Visit to Moscow: The Lot of the Individuals in Moscow." *Industrial Welfare and Personnel Management*, XXXV:145-147, September.

Viereck, P. "Dictatorship over the Proletariat: Portrait of a Fascist Ruling Class." *Dalhousie Review*, XXXIII:20-29, Spring.

—. "The Trojan Dove." *Russian Review*, XII:3-15, January.

Volin, L. "Karl Marx and Russia." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, LII: 165-179, April.

—. "Stalin's Last Testament and the Outlook for Kolkhozy during the Succession." *Journal of Political Economy*, LXI:291-305, August.

Von Mohrenschildt, D. "Russian Area Studies and Research since World War II." *Russian Review*, XII:111-119, April.

Vucinich, A. "First Russian State: An Appraisal of the Soviet Theory." *Speculum*, XXVIII:324-334, April.

—. "Role of Power Myths in Soviet Society." *Pacific Spectator*, VII: 332-343, June.

Vucinich, W. S. "Moslems of the Soviet Union." Habron, J. D. "Spain Turns to the Moslem World." *Current History*, XXIV: 6-16, January.

Waddams, H. "The Church in Soviet Russia." *Soviet Studies*, V:8-17, July.

Walters, E. "Austro-Russian Relations under Goluchowski, 1895-1906." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXI:503-527, June.

Whitby, T. J. "National Bibliography in the U.S.S.R." *Library Quarterly*, XXIII:16-22, January.

White, J. B. "Russia's Western Armoury." *Journal of the Royal United Service Institute*, XCVII: 529-532, November 1952.

Wiles, P. "The Soviet Economy Outpaces the West." *Foreign Affairs*, XXXI:566-580, July.

Willan, T. S. "The Russia Company and Narva, 1558-1581." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXI:405-419, June.

Willen, P. "Can Stalin Have a Successor." *Commentary*, XVI:36-44, July.

Wolfe, B. D. "The Struggle for the Soviet Succession." *Foreign Affairs*, XXXI:548-565, July.

—. "Totalitarianism and History." *Antioch Review*, XIII:155-165, June.

Wraga, R. "Nineteenth Congress of C.P.S.U. (B.)" *Eastern Quarterly*, VI:24-36, January-April.

Zauberman, A. "Equalization of Living Standards within the Soviet Orbit." *Eastern Quarterly*, V:36-43, August-September 1952.

—. "The Soviet Cheap Labour Area in Europe." *Eastern Quarterly*, VI:36-43, October-December.

Zenkovsky, S. A. "A Century of Tartar Revival." *American Slavic and East European Review*, XII: 303-318, October.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir:

I should like to comment on two statements by Mr. Anatole Shub in his review of my book, *Beyond Containment* in your issue of April, 1954. He attributes to me "the notion that Orthodox Christian institutions were 'less democratic' than those of the Roman Church." I do not think anything in the book warrants such an interpretation. I nowhere undertake any comparison in terms of "democracy" between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches. What I suggest is that the Roman Catholic Church, with its greater independence vis-à-vis temporal power, was one element (along with the autonomous nobility and the free cities) that made for a kind of balance of power in medieval Europe and prevented the emergence of any single authority so crushing and unlimited as that of Russian Tsardom.

Mr. Shub also takes me to task for "failure to discuss seriously the question of war." My views on the disillusioning consequences of America's involvement in the First and Second World Wars were set forth fully and vigorously in my book, *America's Second Crusade.* Discussing the possibility of a Third World War in *Beyond Containment* (pp. 357, 358) I say:

"Even if communism should be decisively defeated, the immediate prospective results of a Third World War would be, in all probability, shocking and disillusioning. No responsible civilized statesman would take the initiative in unloosing the terrible destructive possibilities of such a war. Every resource of American and Western statecraft should be employed to remain within the narrow channel between unlimited shooting war and the still more disastrous course of endless retreat and futile appeasement."

William Henry Chamberlin

May 2, 1954

BOOKS ABROAD

An International Quarterly of Comment on Foreign Books

Founded by Roy Temple House
Edited by Ernst Erich Noth

WORLD LITERATURE in review each quarter by distinguished critics both in the United States and abroad. The magazine offers to its readers criticism and analysis of most of the important books issued in languages other than English—a literary harvest obtainable through no other medium.

THE CURRENT OF IDEAS as reflected in leading articles by contributors of established reputation throughout the world. This makes vital reading for everyone interested in the intellectual advancement of our age.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA PRESS, Norman, Oklahoma
Subscription Rates: $7 for two years $4 for one year $1.25 per single copy

OSTEUROPA

Zeitschrift für Gegenwartsfragen des Ostens

The Leading German Review for Soviet and East European Affairs
Editor: Dr. Klaus Mehnert

Contributions of the last issues include:

Bruno Lustig: *Die Psychiatrie in der UdSSR*
Ernest Bauer: *Tito und die Sowjetunion*
Klaus Mehnert: *Die Viererkonferenz von Berlin*
Hans Koch: *Das russisch-ukrainische Verhältnis*
Boris Meissner: *Der Auswärtige Dienst der UdSSR*
Georg M. Werner: *Aussenhandelspolitik der UdSSR nach Stalin*
Hermann Achminow: *Die Oberschicht der Sowjetunion*
Helmut Slapnicka: *Regierung und Verwaltung der Tschechoslowakei*

"Osteuropa" is published by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde, a society of German scholars and experts on Soviet and Eastern questions.

Subscription rates: $2.85 a year, $1.67 a half year, single copy 60¢.

Richard-Wagner-Strasse 11, Stuttgart O, Germany
Walter Goldberg Books, 1966 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y.

